

Ebla und das althebräische Verbalsystem

Für den Alttestamentler, der sich der Faszination der epochalen Funde von *tell-mardih*-Ebla hingibt, sind — neben der archäologischen Evidenz — vor allem die in den Jahren 1974-76 ans Licht getretenen Texte von Bedeutung: ihr Quellenwert bezieht sich einerseits auf die Religionsgeschichte Nordsyriens im 3. Jt. v. Chr.⁽¹⁾, andererseits auf dessen Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte⁽²⁾ angesichts des administrativen Inhalts der meisten bisher entzifferten Tafeln. Die eben in Gang gekommene philologische Erschließung der Urkunden aber wird auch den Althebraisten interessieren, sofern er sein Arbeitsgebiet in den Horizont der vergleichenden historischen Grammatik stellt und dabei über den unmittelbaren Umkreis des Kana-anäischen hinausblickt. Dabei scheint uns vor allem der Beitrag des Eblaitischen für ein semitistisch orientiertes Verstehen des althebr. Verbalsystems von Bedeutung zu sein.

I.

Die Schwierigkeit der Entzifferung und Deutung der bisher publizierten Texte liegt zunächst in ihrer überwiegend sumerographischen Schreibung. Zwar ist man in Ebla offenbar zum ersten Male darangegangen, Keilschriftzeichen systematisch zur Wiedergabe semitischer und sumerischer Silbenwerte zu verwenden⁽³⁾. Dennoch sind in den nicht-lexikalischen Texten aus Ebla immer nur wenige sem. Worte, oft auch nur deren morphematische Elemente, syllabisch ge-

(¹) Vgl. u.a. VF., "Religionsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu den Texten von Ebla", *ZDPV* 96 (1980) 1-19.

(²) Vgl. VF., "Die Texte aus Ebla — eine Herausforderung an die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft", *BZ* 70 (1980) 161-179.

(³) Vgl. M. CIVIL, "Studies on Early Dynastic Lexicography I", *OrAnt* 21 (1982) 1-26, bes. 22.

schrieben. Aber auch bei ihnen ist die Vieldeutigkeit der Lautwiedergabe noch größer als in der späteren Keilschrift: so etwa scheinen doppelte Silbenzeichen oft nur darum gewählt, weil ein geminiertes Konsonant wiedergegeben werden soll⁽⁴⁾. Weitgehend fehlt uns die Kenntnis des spezifisch eblait. Syllabars⁽⁵⁾. — Selbst die zahlreichen sum.-eblait. lexikalischen Listen, die G. Pettinato 1982 veröffentlicht hat⁽⁶⁾, lassen den eblait. Lautstand und Wortschatz bislang nur ungenügend erkennen: die Bedeutungen vieler sum. Lexeme bleibt unbekannt; andere sum. Wörter werden mit eblait. Vokabeln gleichgesetzt, die, wenn wir sie zu bekannten sem. Isoglossen stellen, ihrem sum. Äquivalent allenfalls ungefähr entsprechen. Auffällig ist ja schon, daß bei Verben auf sum. Seite oft Flexionsformen, auf eblait. Seite dagegen nicht-flektierte Bildungen erscheinen.

Die semitistische Bedeutung des Eblait. beruht auf seiner archaischen Stellung unter den sem. Sprachen, auf einem Merkmal also, das zugleich seine Schwierigkeit begründet. Für die Gleichzeitigkeit der Texte mit der späteren frühdynastischen Zeit Mesopotamiens⁽⁷⁾

⁽⁴⁾ So etwa erscheint *ù-mu-mu* für */ummu(m)/*; vgl. G. PETTINATO, "I vocabolari bilingui di Ebla", in: (ed.) L. CAGNI, *La lingua di Ebla. Atti del convegno internazionale. Napoli, 21-23 aprile 1980* (Napoli 1981) 241-276, und M. KREBERNIK, "Zu Syllabar und Orthographie der Texte aus Ebla. Teil 1", *ZA* 72 (1982) 178-236, bes. 226; "Teil 2 (Glossar)", *ZA* 73 (1983) 1-47, bes. 37.

⁽⁵⁾ Vgl. einstweilen die "sillabari e liste di segni" TM.75.G.1385 und TM.75.G.1907 bei G. PETTINATO, *Testi lessicali monolingui della biblioteca L. 2769* (Materiali epigrafici di Ebla [=MEE] 3; Napoli 1981) 187-213, ferner die Zeichenlisten bei D. O. EDZARD, *Verwaltungstexte verschiedenen Inhalts* (Archivi reali di Ebla. Testi [=ARET] 2; Roma 1981) 147-168; A. ARCHI – M. G. BIGA, *Testi amministrativi di vario contenuto* (ARET 3; Roma 1982) 400f. 407f., und vor allem KREBERNIK, *ZA* 72 und 73 (vgl. Anm. 4).

⁽⁶⁾ *Testi lessicali bilingui della biblioteca L. 2769* (MEE 4; Napoli 1982).

⁽⁷⁾ Für die Datierung der Eblatexte geben Gefäße, deren ägyptische Inschriften neben Chefren (4. Dynastie) auch Pepi I (6. Dyn.) nennen (vgl. SCANDORE-MATTHIAE, "Vasi iscritti di Chefren e Pepi I nel palazzo G di Ebla", *Studi Eblaiti* [=StE] 1 [1979] 33-43), ein festes Datum. Gleichwohl reicht man mit einer Datierung z.Zt. Pepis I in die von G. PETTINATO (*Ebla. Un impero inciso nell'argilla* [Milano 1979] 69-74) vorausgesetzte prä-sargonische Zeit zurück, wenn man die Regierungszeit Sargons I mit der frühdynastischen Zeit verschränkt (dazu W. W. HALLO-W. K. SIMPSON, *The Ancient Near East. A History* [New York 1971] 54ff.), die Gutäerzeit auf 40-50 Jahre

spricht dabei das Auftauchen von Listen, die uns schon aus der Fara-Periode⁽⁸⁾ und von *tell-abū-ṣalābīḥ*⁽⁹⁾ bekannt sind; auch das Namenmaterial erinnert an die von R. D. Biggs zusammengestellten sem. Schreibernamen von *tell-abū-ṣalābīḥ*⁽¹⁰⁾. Nur etwas weiter nördlich sucht I. J. Gelb die Heimat der in Ebla herrschenden Schreibertradition, wenn er dafür eine im Gegensatz zur sum.-süd-mesopotamischen Kultur stehende sem. "Kish Civilization" und deren auch nach Mari reichende Ausstrahlung namhaft macht⁽¹¹⁾. Dem Schrift- und Sprachtyp der Eblatexte sind einige kurze Inschriften aus dem ältesten Mari, die älter sind als die administrativen Texte der *šakkanakkū*-Periode⁽¹²⁾ und bis an das Ende der 2. frühdynastischen Periode hinaufreichen⁽¹³⁾, denn auch ähnlich; umgekehrt

begrenzt (HALLO, Art. "Gutium", *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 3 [1957-71] 708-720, bes. § 7) und für die 2. Hälfte des 2.Jts einer niedrigeren Chronologie folgt (dazu J. BOESE-G. WILHELM, "Aššur-Dān, Ninurta-apil-ekur und die mittelasyr. Chronologie", *WZKM* 71 [1979] 19-37), worauf mich Herr Kollege G. Wilhelm (Hamburg) freundlicherweise hingewiesen hat.

(8) So TM.75.G.1488, ein Teilduplikat der Liste von Berufsbezeichnungen E(arly) D(ynastic) LÚ E, die G. PETTINATO in: *Testi lessicali monolingui della biblioteca L. 2769* (MEE 3; Napoli 1981) 27ff. (vgl. *OrAnt* 15 [1976] 165-178) publiziert hat, und die Liste von Vogelnamen TM.75.G.1451 bei PETTINATO, MEE 3, 105ff. (vgl. *OrAnt* 17 [1978] 165-178), womit der von A. DEIMEL (*Die Inschriften von Fara* 2 [Leipzig 1923] 58 VI 11ff.) publizierte Text identisch ist. Zu ED LÚ A (*Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon* 12 [Roma 1974] 3ff.) vgl. das eblait. Pendant in MEE 3, 3ff.

(9) So der "atlante geografico" TM.75.G.2231, eine Liste von Städtenamen, bei G. PETTINATO (*Or* 47 [1978] 50-73, bes. 54-59), die mit einem von R. D. BIGGS (*Inscriptions from Tell Abū Ṣalābīḥ* [Oriental Institute Publications 99; Chicago 1974] 71-78) publizierten Text identisch ist.

(10) "Semitic Names in the Fara Period", *Or* 36 (1967) 55-66; *Inscriptions from Tell Abū Ṣalābīḥ*, 26f.

(11) "Thoughts about Ibla", *Syro-Mesopotamian Studies (= SMS)* I/1 (1977) 3-30, bes. 13ff.; "Ebla and the Kish Civilization", in: CAGNI, *La lingua di Ebla*, 9-73, bes. 52ff.

(12) Vgl. E. LIMET, *Textes administratifs de l'époque des šakkanakku* (ARM 19; Paris 1976); zu deren möglicher Beziehung zur Sprache von Ebla vgl. GELB, *SMS* I/1, 9-12, *La lingua di Ebla*, 63/4.

(13) Etwa D. O. EDZARD, "Pantheon und Kult in Mari", in: (ed.) J.-R. KUPPER, *XV^e rencontre assyriologique internationale* (Paris 1967) 51/2' (Lit.); vgl. I. J. GELB, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar* (Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary 2; Chicago 1961) 2; *La lingua di Ebla*, 63, wo "common linguistic features of Early Dynastic Mari and Ebla" genannt werden, und KRECHER, *La lingua di Ebla*, 140 mit Anm.15. 142; dagegen hebt E. SOLL-

stammt aus Mari ein in Ebla gefundener Brief Enna-Dagans TM.75.G.2367⁽¹⁴⁾. Begegnet uns also im Eblait.-Frühmariotischen eine Gestalt des Akkadischen, die die Träger des Reichs von Akkade vor dessen Aufkommen verwendeten? Oder geht das Eblait.-Frühmariotische auf eine sem. sprechende Bevölkerung zurück, die noch vor den Akkadern nach Nordsyrien und Mesopotamien kam? Auf diese "Präakkader" könnte auch das älteste sem. Superstrat des Sum. hinweisen, das vielleicht schon in den archaischen Texten aus Ur, sicher seit der Farazeit bezeugt ist⁽¹⁵⁾. Entsprechend ist das Eblait. durch eine Reihe nordsem(?) Eigentümlichkeiten gekennzeichnet⁽¹⁶⁾, die schwer mit dem Altakkad. und Babylonischen übereinkommen, wohl aber im konservativen, dem Eblait. auch geographisch nahestehenden Altassyrischen und teilweise im Amurritischen wiederkehren.

BERGER (bei D. O. EDZARD, *StE* 3 [1980] 122²) formale Ähnlichkeiten zwischen den Eblatexten und den Inschriften des Lugalzagesi hervor.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Erstbearbeitung G. PETTINATO, "Bollettino militare della campagna di Ebla contro la città di Mari", *OrAnt* 19 (1980) 231-245; vgl. B. KIENAST, "Der Feldzugbericht des Ennadagan in literarhistorischer Sicht", *das.* 247-261. Neubearbeitung D. O. EDZARD, "Neue Erwägungen zum Brief des Enna-Dagan von Mari", *StE* 4 (1981) 89-94.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Vgl. GELB, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, 4f., und BIGGS, *Or.* 36, 55¹.56^{1,2}; zum Einfluß des Sem. in den Texten von *tell-abū-šalābiḥ* DERS., *Inscriptions*, 27.32.62. — Zum umstrittenen Vorkommen sem. Namen und anderer sem. Sprachelemente in den archaischen Texten aus Ur vgl. BIGGS, *Or.* 36, 56³ (Lit.), und W. H. PH. ROEMER, *Einführung in die Sumerologie* (Nijmegen ²1982) 10.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Zur Klassifikation des Eblait. als nordsem. Sprache vgl. W. VON SODEN, "Das Nordsem. in Babylonien und in Syrien", *La lingua di Ebla*, 355-361. Andernfalls müßte man das Eblait. etwa zusammen mit dem Assyr. als eine Art Nord- oder Westakkad. klassifizieren; dagegen aber sprechen vor allem Differenzen in der Phonetik, der Nominalbildung, bei den Präpositionen und im übrigen Wortschatz, worauf W. VON SODEN in einem Referat auf dem Colloquio internazionale su "La lingua di Ebla e la linguistica semitica" (Firenze, 24.-26.6.1982) hingewiesen hat (Herr von Soden hat mir freundlicherweise sein Manuskript zur Verfügung gestellt, wofür ich ihm herzlich danke). Dem Akkad. fremd, aber für das Eblait. eigentümlich sind auch Nomina-actionis-Bildungen, die sowohl ein /t-/Präformativ, als auch ein /-t-/Infix enthalten, etwa *tù-uš-tá-ki-lum/lu-um* (= sum. *tés-tés-kú* [!]) MEE 4, Nr. 164.0422 zu /*akālum*/ "essen"; anders jetzt KREBERNIK, *ZA* 73, 6 (dieser "Teil 2 [Glossar]" von Kreberniks wichtiger Arbeit [vgl. unsere Anm. 4] konnte in dem vorliegenden Artikel nur noch ausnahmsweise herangezogen werden).

Die bisherigen grammatischen Versuche zum Eblait. ergeben einen auffälligen Mangel an morphologischer und semantischer Standardisierung etwa der Konjugationsarten sowie eine noch geringe Symmetrie des Verbalsystems. Insofern bestätigt das Eblait. die von W. Diem jüngst in anderem Zusammenhang bewährte Voraussetzung, "daß die Entwicklung von Sprache vom unregelmäßigen, asymmetrischen Paradigma zum regelmäßigen, symmetrischen Paradigma verläuft"; die Entwicklung der sem. Einzelsprachen aus dem Ursem. sei geradezu als die Realisierung der Möglichkeit anzusehen, "ein im Ursem. entstandenes unregelmäßiges Paradigma auszugleichen"⁽¹⁷⁾. Divergierende Merkmale, die später für differente Dialekte und Sprachen charakteristisch werden, scheinen im Eblait. noch promiscue gebraucht zu sein. — Der Eindruck grammatischer und lexikalischer Buntheit, den die bisherige Forschung am Eblait. hinterläßt, mag allerdings auch darin seine Ursache haben, daß das Material für die Sprachbearbeitung noch überwiegend der Personennamenbildung entnommen wird: die Personennamen sind die einzige Syntagmengruppe, die überwiegend syllabisch geschrieben wird. Gerade die Personennamen aber haben wie im Fall des Amurr. einen weiten geographischen Herkunftsbereich, wie die den Namen oft beigegebenen Heimatbezeichnungen vermuten lassen; selbst wenn sich genuin eblait. Namen isolieren ließen, würde ihr Idiom gegenüber der prosaischen und poetischen Textsprache, wie etwa auch im Hebr., wieder als archaisch anzusehen sein⁽¹⁸⁾.

II.

Für ein historisches Verständnis der hebr. Grammatik, insbesondere des hebr. Verbalsystems, könnte die Erforschung des Eblait. vor allem insofern etwas erbringen, als das Hebr. ähnlich wie das Äthiopische und das Altsüdarabische eine Anzahl archaischer Elemente bewahrt zu haben scheint: allbekannt ist dafür die im Vergleich mit dem Akkad. und Arab. noch unvollkommene Ausbildung des Dreikonsonantenschemas und die große Zahl gegenseitiger Berührungen

⁽¹⁷⁾ "Die Entwicklung des Derivationsmorphems der *t*-Stämme im Sem.", *ZDMG* 132 (1982) 29-84, bes. 31.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Zum anderssprachlichen Charakter der Personennamengebung vgl. GELB, *La lingua di Ebla*, 43f.

schwacher Verben verschiedener Klassen mit der gleichen Zweikonsonantenbasis⁽¹⁹⁾. Es ist also zu vermuten, daß das hebr. Verbalsystem noch weitere archaische Züge aufweist, die sich durch den Vergleich mit frühsem. Sprachen erheben lassen.

1. Nach verbreiteter Ansicht ist die Verbalkonjugation von den Imperativen *q(u)tuł*, *q(i)tuł* und *q(i)tuł* ausgegangen, also von einem ursprünglichen nomen actionis in dessen kürzest möglicher Form⁽²⁰⁾, das, vermehrt um eine nach Person, Geschlecht und Numerus weiter differenzierende Präformativsilbe, zunächst die Kurzformen einer Präformativkonjugation (PKKF), nämlich *jaqtuł*, *jiqtuł* und *jaqtuł*, ergibt⁽²¹⁾: diese bezeichnen zunächst die punktuelle Aktionsart, später sowohl den jussivischen Modus als auch das präteritale Tempus im Indikativ. Der Jussiv **jaqtuł* u.ä. und das Präteritum **jaqtuł* u.ä. mögen schon früh durch die Betonung unterschieden worden sein, was das Hebr. etwa noch durch die Opposition von Jussiv *jāqôm* und Präteritum *wajjāqom* widerspiegelt⁽²²⁾.

Aus den PKKF *jaqtuł*, *jiqtuł* und *jaqtuł* lassen sich die Langformen der Präformativkonjugation (PKLF) ableiten, die ursprünglich z.T. gleichzeitig nebeneinander bestanden haben können, sich später

(19) Vgl. G. BERGSTRÄSSER, *Hebr. Grammatik* 2 (Nachdruck Hildesheim 1962) § 31.

(20) Der Charakter des Imp. als nomen actionis ergibt sich aus seiner Identität mit einer Form des Infinitivs, etwa des hebr. Inf. cs.

(21) Vgl. C. BROCKELMANN, *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der sem. Sprachen* 1 (Nachdruck Hildesheim 1982) § 258A, aber auch G. R. DRIVER, *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System* (Edinburgh 1936) 32-33 u.a.

(22) Vgl. T. W. THACKER, *The Relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian Verbal Systems* (Oxford 1954) 183f., und vor allem R. HETZRON ("The Evidence of Perfect **y'aqtuł* and Jussive **yaqt'uł* in Proto-Semitic", *JSS* 14 [1969] 1-21), der Spuren dieser Opposition auch im Akkad., im Ge'ez und im Arab. finden will. — Entgegen der communis opinio ist der jussivische Modus nicht auf die PKKF beschränkt. Auch die Afformativkonjugation (AK) kann — wie das ägypt. Pseudopartizip — jussivisch verwendet werden: im Akkad. spricht *lû* + Stativ den Wunsch nach einem Zustand aus; im Ugar., Phön. und Arab. kann die AK auch ohne einen besonderen Indikator jussivisch verwendet werden; im Hebr. hat sich aus diesem Gebrauch das "perfectum consecutivum" gebildet. Auffällig nun ist dessen — offenbar spät wiederhergestellte — Ultima-Betonung (*wəqāṭaltī*), die sich nicht mehr auf den Vokalismus auswirkt: sie entspricht einem Jussiv **jaqtuł*.

aber auf differente Sprachen verteilen. (1.) Aus *jaqtul*, *jiqtal* und *jaqtil* entstehen durch Einfügung von /á/ zwischen dem 1. und 2. Radikal die akkad. PKLF-Bildungen *irappud*, *iparras* und *ipaqqid*; ihnen entspricht äthiop. *jəqáttēl*, während im Hebr. die Bildung bei Verben mit vorwiegend durativischer Bedeutung ins Pi'el übergegangen ist⁽²³⁾. (2.) Aus *jaqtul* wird durch Anfügung von /-u/ *jaqtulu*, wie es höchst wahrscheinlich im Ugar.⁽²⁴⁾, sicher in der Sprache der Amarnabriefe von Byblos⁽²⁵⁾ und im Arab. vorliegt. Modus finalis mit /-a/ statt /-u/ begegnet im Arab. und als Kohortativ in der 1.P. im Hebr. (3.) Bislang semitistisch kaum beachtet ist die im Hebr. bezeugte Kenntlichmachung der PKLF durch Herstellung bzw. Beibehaltung der Länge des Stammvokals. Hergestellt wird die Länge des Stammvokals im Hiph'il auch der starken Verben, wo aus der PKKF *jaqtēl* < *jaqtil* die PKLF *jaqtīl* abgeleitet werden kann. Beibehalten wird die Länge des Stammvokals im Qal und Hiph'il der Verben II inf. (*jāqūm* bzw. *jāqīm* im Gegensatz zur PKKF mit gekürztem Stammvokal *jāqōm* < *jaqum* bzw. *jāqēm* < *jaqim*) und der Verben III inf. (*jiglā* u.ä. im Gegensatz zur PKKF mit gekürztem Stammvokal *jigl/jigāl*). Die PKLF bezeichnet wohl zunächst die durativische Aktionsart, später das präsentisch-futurische Tempus im Indikativ.

Entsprechende Imperative (a.) sowie PKKF (b.) und PKLF (c.) existieren auch im Eblait.

a. An Imp. sind *q(u)tul*-Bildungen wie in den Personennamen *a-šur-ma-lik* "versorge, o Malik"⁽²⁶⁾ und *ru₁₂-pū-uš-li-im* "zertrete, o Lim" und *q(i)til*-Bildungen wie *zi-kir-da-mu* "nenne (seinen Namen), o Damu" bezeugt.

⁽²³⁾ Vgl. VF., "Zur Geschichte des hebr. Verbs — Diachronie der Konjugationsthemen", *BZ* 73 (1983) 34-57, bes. 43 (Lit.).

⁽²⁴⁾ Vgl. *UT* § 9.10.

⁽²⁵⁾ Vgl. W. L. MORAN, *A Syntactic Study of the Dialect of Byblos* (Diss. John Hopkin's University 1950) 43-47.

⁽²⁶⁾ Für die Einzelbelege der im folgenden zitierten Personennamen muß hier auf die Register von MEE 1 und 2 sowie ARET 2 und 3, sowie auf PETTINATO, *Ebla*, 314-319; *OrAnt* 18 (1979) 211-213, verwiesen werden. Vgl. zu den Einzelbildungen auch VF., "Das eblait. Verbalsystem nach den bisher veröffentlichten Personennamen", *La lingua di Ebla*, 211-233; "Neue Erwägungen zum eblait. Verbalsystem", demnächst in den *Atti del Convegno internazionale Napoli 1982*.

Bei den Verben III inf. gibt es neben den regelrechten *q(i)til*-Bildungen wie *si-mi(-ni)-UD.KÙ* "höre (mich), o GN" solche mit thematischem Vokal /a/: *si/ši-ma-^dku-ra* "höre, o Kura" oder *ši-qá-da-mu* "tränke, o Damu".

b. Die PKKF findet sich in allen drei Vokalisationstypen.

jaqtul scheint schon hier für fientisch-transitive Verben vorbehalten: *ig-mul-da-mu* "Damu tat wohl", *ik-bù-ul-ma-lik* "Malik fesselte", *ik-šu_{II}-ud* "er erreichte", *ik/iḫ-šu_{II}-up-da-mu* "Damu verzauberte", die Kontextform *[i]k-tub* "er schrieb" TM.75.G.2342 VI 6⁽²⁷⁾, *ip-ḫur+GN* "GN versammelte", *ip-ṭur-NI* "GN löste"⁽²⁸⁾ u.ä.

Dagegen gehen nach *jigtal* fientisch-transitive (*en-ar/ār+GN* /*(j)inḫar+GN*/ "GN schlug", *ip-te-da-mu* "Damu öffnete", *iš-al+GN* "GN suchte") und fientisch-intransitive Verben (*ir-à-aq-da-mu* "Damu entfernte sich", *en-ḫar+GN* "GN schnaubte", *ir-kab+GN* "GN fuhr").

Nach *jaqtul* werden Nominalkonjugationen (Zustandsverben) gebildet wie *im₄-lik+GN* "GN wurde Herrscher", das Hypokoristikon mit Nominativendung *a-mi-du* /*a'mid-u*/ "ich habe Zuflucht (scil. bei GN)", aber auch fientische Verben wie *ig-ri-iš+GN* "GN machte weit", *i-bi-ni-li-im* "Lim rief mich", *i-bi-iṭ-li-im* "Lim leuchtete auf", *i-di+GN* /*(j)iddi(n)+GN*/ "GN gab", *ir-ib+GN* "GN machte weit" u.ä. — Die gegenseitige Zuordnung von Vokalisations- und Bedeutungstypen ist wie im Akkad. noch nicht voll standardisiert; sie gedieh ja auch in den jüngeren Sprachen nie zu regelrechter Konsequenz.

Die aus dem Akkad., Amurr., Ugar. und aus der hebr. Personennamengebung⁽²⁹⁾ bekannte präteritale Funktion der PKKF wird also auch durch das Eblait. erhärtet⁽³⁰⁾. Den archaischen Charakter des hebr. Narrativs ("imperfectum consecutivum") *wajjiqtōl* hat be-

⁽²⁷⁾ Publikation G. PETTINATO, *RBibI* 25 (1977) 238-242, bes. 240. Zu dem nach MEE 1, Nr. 6 und 15, aufgefundenen *ik-túb* vgl. iti GIŠ *ig-DÚB* ARET 2, 5 II 11f.; IV 4f., aber auch J. KRECHER, "Sumerogramme und syllabische Orthographie in den Texten aus Ebla", in: *La lingua di Ebla*, 135-154, bes. 136f; und MEE 4, 1240.1241.

⁽²⁸⁾ Zur Lesung von NI vgl. VF., "Gab es in Ebla einen Gottesnamen Ja?", *ZA* 70 (1980) 70-92; "Der Jahwenname und seine Deutung Ex 3,14 im Licht der Textpublikationen aus Ebla", *Bib* 62 (1981) 305-327.

⁽²⁹⁾ Vgl. J. J. STAMM, "Hebräische Ersatznamen", in: *Beiträge zur hebr. und altorientalischen Namenkunde* (Orbis biblicus et orientalis 30; Freiburg-Göttingen 1980) 59-80, bes. 62f.

⁽³⁰⁾ Vgl. schon PETTINATO, *Ebla*, 71-73; GELB, *SMS* I/1, 21f.

kanntlich schon H. Bauer⁽³¹⁾ erkannt. Dazu zeigen einige der bisher publizierten Eblatexte, daß im Handlungsfortgang nach *wa-* "und" das Subjekt gern hinter das Verb tritt, so daß eine Entsprechung zu der hebr. Konstruktion {*wajjiqtōl* + Subjekt}⁽³²⁾ vorliegt: etwa in *wa du₁₁-ga en* "da sprach der Herrscher" TM.75.G.1444 IV 4-6⁽³³⁾, *wa i-gub en gaba dku-ra* "und es trat hin der Herrscher vor(?) Kura" das. XIV 14-18, *wa nam-ku₅ en gaba dku-ra* "und es schwor der Herrscher vor(?) Kura" XVI 14 – XVII 1 und *wa i-na-sum en ugula-sù wa x-sù AN-ma^{ki} Za-mi-um^{ki} UR-lu^{ki} Gi-rí ugula Ba-'à-ma-an^{ki}* "und es gab der Herrscher seinen Stattherrn und seinen... (sowie die Orte) A., Z. und U. dem G., dem Stattherrn von B." XVIII 8-19. Freilich stellt die Identifikation des jeweils vom Kontext geforderten Präteritums als PKKF einen kleinen Unsicherheitsfaktor dar; doch werden punktuelle Verben wie *du₁₁* (-g) "sprechen" (im Gegensatz zu durativem *e* "reden") im Sumerischen meist präterital, als *hamtu*, verwendet, so daß zumindest in dem. o.g. *wa du₁₁-ga en* mit punktual-präteritaler Bedeutung zu rechnen ist. — {*wa* + präteritales Verb} ohne folgendes Subjekt liegt vor in *wa dš-bù wa 'a_x (NI)-i* "da ...-te ich und lebte(?)" TM.75.G.1444 XV 14-17^(33a).

Bei den Verben III inf. kann wie beim Imp. der Wurzelsvokal /*ṛ*/ und /*ū*/ durch den thematischen Vokal /*a*/ ersetzt werden: so erscheint *ab-ri-a-ḥu* "ich sah den Bruder" von der Wurzel *BRĪ* neben *ab-ra-ḥu* mit gleicher Bedeutung⁽³⁴⁾.

c. Eblait. PKLF entsprechend akkad. *iparras* könnten in den von G. Pettinato (*OrAnt* 18 [1979] 329-351) edierten *én-é-nu-ru-TeX-*

⁽³¹⁾ *Die Tempora im Sem.* (Beiträge zur Assyriologie 8; Leipzig 1912) 26.

⁽³²⁾ Das Alter des hebraistisch sog. "impf. cs." erhellt auch aus dessen Vorkommen im Altsüdarab., wo es freilich — anders als im Hebr. — nicht zur regelmäßigen Form des Narrativs wurde; vgl. M. HÖFNER, *Altsüdarab. Grammatik* (Porta linguarum orientalium 24; Leipzig 1943) § 61; A. F. L. BEESTON, *A Descriptive Grammar of Epigraphic South Arabic* (London 1962) § 52, 10.

⁽³³⁾ Publikation D. O. EDZARD, "Der Text TM.75.G.1444 aus Ebla", *StE* 4 (1981) 35-59.

^(33a) Vgl. die ähnliche Konstruktion mit *-ma* "und" *'à-si-kà-ma du₁₁-ga an-tá* "ich habe dich ge..., und du sagtest" *ARET* 2, 33 VII 10 – VIII 1.

⁽³⁴⁾ Vgl. VF., *Bib* 62, 312; *La lingua di Ebla*, 228f.

ten vorliegen, wie I. J. Gelb vermutet: etwa in *ba-li-ḥa-a* ^dSIG₇.AMA *tá-ša-a* /*tašša'ā*/ "DN₁ DN₂ will go out" TM.75.G.2038 I 4-6⁽³⁵⁾. D. O. Edzard will mit Vorbehalt *a-'à-a* TM.75.G.1444 XIII 11 als /*aḥajja*/ "ich werde leben" deuten⁽³⁶⁾. E. Sollberger erwägt zu *a-sa-ma* nach einem Vorschlag Gelbs /*ašamma*/ "ich werde hören"⁽³⁷⁾. In der Personennamengebung ist das Präsens-Futur zumindest so selten wie im Akkad.⁽³⁸⁾ — Eine sichere Entsprechung zu *jaqtulu* scheint bisher nicht vorzuliegen.

2. In der Affirmativkonjugation (AK) werden ursprünglich Nomina, speziell Adjektive, konjugiert⁽³⁹⁾, wobei wie im Akkad. die Substantivkonjugation lexikalisch auf Wörter mit beschreibender (prädikativer) Funktion⁽⁴⁰⁾ beschränkt geblieben zu sein scheint.

Im Eblait. wird die AK in Personennamen zunächst wie der akkad. Stativ tempusneutral und nicht-aktivisch⁽⁴¹⁾ gebraucht, u.zw. von Adjektiven und Substantiven: *wa-at-ra-im* "hervorragend ist Haddu/Adad", *wa-at-ra-bù* "hervorragend ist der (göttliche?) Vater", *a-ba-il* "ein Vater ist Il". Morphologisch interessant ist an der Konjugationsform das /-a/ als Morphem der 3.P.m.sg., das ursprünglich offenbar mit mimationslosem /-a/ als Endung des prädikativen Akkusativs identisch ist⁽⁴²⁾; das Hebr. kennt dieses /-a/ bekanntlich noch als Bindevokal vor Suffixen⁽⁴³⁾. — *wa-at-ra-im*, *wa-at-ra-bù*

⁽³⁵⁾ *La lingua di Ebla*, 35/6.40.

⁽³⁶⁾ *StE* 4, 43.

⁽³⁷⁾ "The So-Called Treaty Between Ebla and Ashur", *StE* 3 (1980) 129-155, bes. 140f.

⁽³⁸⁾ Vgl. J. J. STAMM, *Die akkadische Namengebung* (MVÄG 44; Leipzig 1939) 95.

⁽³⁹⁾ Vgl. Vf., "Die Konjugation von Nomina im Althebr.", demnächst in *ZAW*.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Substantive, die nur benennende Funktion haben wie Namen und etwa die Äquivalente für "Himmel", "Erde" u.ä. werden offenbar nicht konjugiert, wohl aber der Begriff "Gott", der auch prädikative Funktion hat.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Wir verwenden im folgenden den Terminus 'nicht-aktivisch' als Oberbegriff für 'neutrisch' und 'passivisch'.

⁽⁴²⁾ So I. J. GELB, "The Origin of the West Semitic Qatala Morpheme", in: *Symbolae Linguisticae in honorem Georgii Kuryłowicz* (Breslau-Warschau-Krakau 1965) 72-80.

⁽⁴³⁾ Dabei zeigt die 3.P.m.sg. AK dreikonsonantiger Wurzeln eine Tendenz auf Verkürzung zur Zweisilbigkeit — entweder durch Elision des Endmorphems /-a/ (*a-dar-li-im* "mächtig ist Lim") wie hebr. *qatal* im Gegensatz zu arab. *qatala* oder durch Elision des Vokals zwischen dem 2. und 3. Radi-

und *a-ba-il* können sowohl als Nominalsatz⁽⁴⁴⁾ wie als Verbalsatz aufgefaßt werden⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Wird die AK von fientischen Verben gebraucht, so tendieren diese schon bei intransitiven Lexemen zu (aktivisch-)präteritalen Bedeutungen: *qā-bi-lum* /*qab(i)+ 'ilum*/ "gesprochen worden ist von Ilum" > "gesprochen hat Ilum" oder *qā-ma-da-mu* "Bestand hat > aufgestanden ist Damu"⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Die AK von transitiven Verben scheint in Kontextbelegen wie meist im Akkad. passivisch verwendet zu sein: in der Wendung *lú a-mur-da-mu pá-ú²-gú* "was Amurdamu fortgenommen (worden) ist" TM.75.G.1430 II 2 – III 1 läßt sich *pá-ú²-gú* als /*pa''ug-u*/, d.h. nach Analogie der späteren assyr. 3.P.m.sg. AK (Stativ) des D-Stamms mit Subordinativ-Endung /-u/ von der Wurzel *PŪG* "(gewaltsam) wegnehmen", erklären⁽⁴⁷⁾. *sá-ù-mu* /*sa''umu*/ TM.75.G.2367 II 1.13; IV 2 könnte passivisches Verbaladjektiv des D-Stamms von *ŠĪM* "setzen, stellen" sein⁽⁴⁸⁾. Auch die AK transitiver Verben be-

kal in dem o.g. *wa-at-ra-im* (< **watara*); letzteres erinnert an hebr. *qāṭēlā* 3.P.f.sg. und *qāṭēlū* 3.P.pl., wo die Vortondehnung unregelmäßigerweise ausbleibt, sowie an äthiop. *gābra*.

(44) Zum Ursprung der akkad. AK beim Nominalsatz vgl. G. BUCCELLATI, "An Interpretation of Akkadian Stative as a Nominal Sentence", *JNES* 27 (1968) 1-12.

(45) Da also /-a/ sowohl diachronisch als Akkusativ-Morphem, als auch synchronisch als Morphem der 3.P.m.sg. interpretierbar ist, bleibt offen, ob /*aba*/ Nomen oder Verb ist. Die altsem. AK von Nomina weist in eine Zeit zurück, in der eine eigene lexikalische Klasse 'Verbum', d.h. für den prädiikativen Gebrauch reservierter Begriffe, noch nicht existierte.

(46) Vgl. die amurr. Bildungen *qa-la-^da-m[i]* "gesprochen hat mein (göttlicher) Onkel", *qa-ma-da-num* /*qām-a+dann-um*/ "'der Starke' ist aufgestanden" und *qā-am-ta-AN* "du bist aufgestanden, o AN"; I. J. GELB, *Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite* (Assyriological Studies 21; Chicago 1981).

(47) Erstpublikation P. FRONZAROLI, "Il verdetto per A'mur-Damu e sua madre", *StE* 3 (1980) 65-78; Neubearbeitung G. PETTINATO, *MEE* 3 (1981) 258-260.

(48) Publikation G. PETTINATO, *OrAnt* 19 (1980) 231-245, bes. 238f. — An Verbaladj. D von *ŠĪM* denkt GELB, *La lingua di Ebla*, 39. PETTINATO, a.a.O. 243, will dagegen einen Inf. anstelle eines verbum finitum finden (faktisch 1.P.sg.: "ho assediato"). — EDZARD (*StE* 4, 90), erwägt, den Kontext *sá-ù-mu* ... GÍN.ŠĒ als {tautologischen Inf. (inf. abs.) + finite Verbform} von einer Wurzel mit der Bedeutung "siegreich schlagen" zu verstehen (vgl. zu GÍN.ŠĒ bzw. *tùn-šè* KIENAST, *OrAnt* 19, 257f.); *sá-ù-mu* /*sa''umu*/ wäre dann nach Analogie des assyr. *qa''ulum* gebildeter Inf. des D-Stamms. Für die

schränkt sich insofern also — auch wie meist im Akkad. — auf eine nicht-aktivistische Aussage, wie wir sie aus den sog. Ergativsprachen^(48a) kennen. Freilich geht nur die sem. AK⁽⁴⁹⁾, nicht auch der Imp. und die PK von der nicht-aktivistischen Bedeutung aus; vermutlich war die AK ursprünglich der Konjugation der nicht-aktivistischen Adjektive vorbehalten.

Für die nicht-aktivistische AK wurde in den westsem. Sprachen, nachdem die AK Qal fientischer Verben für die präterital(-aktivistische), "perfektische" Bedeutung vorbehalten worden war, erst eigens ein 'inneres Passiv' gebildet⁽⁵⁰⁾. Die im Hebr. dafür spezifische Vokalfolge /u/ - /a/, für die es noch im Akkad. keine Entsprechung etwa in einem Adjektivtypus **puras* gibt, kommt mit passivischer Bedeutung in den AK Qal *jul(l)ād* "er ist geboren (worden)" [dazu Adj. *jul(l)ād* bzw. *jūlād* Ri 8,8], *luqqah* "er ist genommen (worden)" [dazu Adj. *luqqāh* und PK *juqqah*] und *mōrāt(t)ā* "blankgefeßt wurde es" Ez 21,16 [dazu Adj. *mōrāt* Jes 18,7 und das analog gebildete Pu'al-Part. *mēmōrāt*] und mit neutrischer Bedeutung in der PK Qal *jūkal* "er wird fähig / überlegen (werden)" sowie in den Adjektiven *'ukkāl* "verzehrt" Ex 3,3 und *jūqāšim* "gefangene" Qoh 12,12 vor. Für das nicht-aktivistische genus verbi stehen im Hebr. neben dem ebenfalls mit /u/ - /a/ gebildeten

von Edzard ebenfalls erwogene Interpretation von *Sá-ù-mu* als Herrschernamen spricht allerdings, daß in den folgenden Abschnitten des Briefes an der betr. Stelle die Herrscher *Iš-tup-šar* V 3 und *Ib-lul-il* VI 5, VIII 9 (vgl. VII 2) genannt werden.

^(48a) Für die Ergativsprachen ist charakteristisch, daß ihr Konjugationssystem das Handlungsobjekt einer transitiven Verbalaussage wie das Subjekt einer intransitiven Aussage behandelt; das Handlungsobjekt wird dabei zumindest dann zum Subjekt des von der betreffenden Handlung hervorgerufenen Zustands, wenn das Handlungsobjekt in der Aussage nicht genannt wird. Die syntaktische Kategorie eines direkten Objekts fehlt in Ergativsprachen ebenso wie die morphologische eines Akkusativs. Vgl. A. MARTINEZ, *Synchronische Sprachwissenschaft* (München 1968) 181-195, ferner D. A. FOXVOG, *Or.* 44 (1975) 395-425, bes. 396, und G. STEINER, "Intransitiv-passivische und aktivische Verbalauffassung", *ZDMG* 126 (1976) 229-280, bes. 229-233 (Lit.). — "Ob das Semitische nicht einmal eine Ergativsprache gewesen ist", hat im Blick auf die eblait. Befunde auch KIENAST (*La lingua di Ebla*, 90) gefragt.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Nur insoweit wäre also I. M. DIAKONOFF, *Semito-Hamitic Languages* (Moskau 1965) 78-99, zuzustimmen; vgl. die Besprechung von D. O. EDZARD, *RA* 61 (1967) 137-149, bes. 143-145.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Ursprünglich hätte das Sem. danach kein einheitliches Passiv gehabt; es bediente sich der AK für das Nicht-Aktiv und der Stämme mit *t*-Infix für das Reflexiv bzw. Reziprok.

Stämmen Pu'al und Hoph'al das Niph'al und allenfalls das Hitpa'el zur Verfügung⁽⁵¹⁾; schon die Redundanz der nicht-aktivistischen Stämme zeigt deren Ersatzfunktion für die alte nicht-aktivistische AK.

In bislang einem Kontext wird die AK eines transitiven Verbs, wie es selten auch im Akkad. geschieht, aktivisch gebraucht: 56 UD:KÙ lú *ma-ḫi-la é* SA.ZA_x^{ki} "56 (Einheiten) Silber, die das Haus ... empfangen hat"⁽⁵²⁾. Die Kongruenz der 3.P.m.sg. /*maḫira*/ besteht dabei zum Handlungsobjekt é "Haus", das nun Aussagesubjekt ist. /-a/ ist entweder Endmorphem für die 3.P.m.sg., also Indikator eines ursprünglichen casus praedicativus, oder Subordinativenendung⁽⁵³⁾. Das Sumerogramm lú steht für den Akkusativ des Relativpronomens.

Die präterital-aktivistische AK transitiver Verben kommt aber, wie es scheint⁽⁵⁴⁾, auch in Personennamen vor⁽⁵⁵⁾. Hierzu wäre hinzuweisen auf: *a-kà-al-ma-lik* "gefressen hat (meinen Verwandten der Totengott) Malik"⁽⁵⁶⁾, *ba-na-a-ḫu* "geschaffen hat der (göttliche) Bruder", *ba-qā-da-mu* "verheert hat Damu", *da-na-il* "gerichtet hat

⁽⁵¹⁾ Schon im Bibl.-Aram. ist das Adj. der häufigen Struktur *qatīl* > *qetīl* zum Ausgangspunkt einer Passiv-Qal-Konjugation geworden, wie im Prinzip schon J. WELLHAUSEN (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 27 [1887] 967) erkannt hat. — Das hebr. Part. Qal pass. *qātūl* dagegen ist nicht zugleich Ausgangspunkt einer Konjugation.

⁽⁵²⁾ TM.75.G.1782 VII 17 – VIII 3; Publikation EDZARD, ARET 2, 21.

⁽⁵³⁾ /-a/ kommt als Subordinativmorphem (Morphem des "modus relativus") auch altakkad. und altbabyl. vor; D. O. EDZARD, "Die Modi beim älteren akkad. Verbum", *Or.* 42 (1973) 121-141, bes. 127 mit Anm. 15.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Anders etwa E. LIPIŃSKI, "Formes verbales dans les noms propres d'Ebla et système verbal sémitique", in: *La lingua di Ebla*, 191-210.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ So GELB, *La lingua di Ebla*, 36-40; VF., *das.*, 218-223; P. FRONZAROLI, "La contribution de la langue d'Ebla à la connaissance du sémitique archaïque", in: (ed.) H. J. NISSEN-J. RINGER, *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn. XXVIII. Rencontre assyriologique internationale, Berlin 3. bis 7. Juli 1978, Teil 2* (Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 1; Berlin 1982) 131-145, bes. 140 (3.2.1).

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Offenbar handelt es sich um einen Ersatznamen: der Benannte tritt an die Stelle eines zuvor verstorbenen Verwandten, den er mithin "ersetzt" bzw. wiederverkörpert; auch in akkad. Beispielen stellt der Ersatzname dabei oft nur den Tod des betr. Verwandten fest (Beispiele bei STAMM, *Akkad. Namengebung* 296f.). Zum Gebrauch von akkad. *akālu(m)* "(fr)essen" von Krankheitsgöttern u.ä. vgl. *AHW* s.v. G 6b; *CAD* s.v. 5a.

II”⁽⁵⁷⁾ (vgl. *da-ni* und *da-ni-lum*)(⁵⁸), *ḥa-ra-il* “erwählt (?) hat II”, *qá-na-ab* bzw. *qá-na-bù* “erworben / geschaffen hat der (göttliche) Vater”. Alle hier in der AK gebrauchten Verbalwurzeln sind eblait. auch durch andere Flexionsformen belegt(⁵⁹). Für den ergativischen Charakter der offenbar ursprünglich der Adjektivkonjugation vorbehaltenen AK ist zunächst die Objektorientierung der Aussage charakteristisch; sie aber schlägt mit dem Übergang der AK vom Nicht-Aktiv zum Aktiv in eine Aussageorientierung am Handlungssubjekt um. Eine Nominativ-Aktiv-Akkusativ-Struktur, auf die die primär verbale PK tendiert, mag dabei auf die AK eingewirkt haben(⁶⁰). Die Spur eines alten Agentiv-Kasus, wie er in Ergativsprachen das Handlungssubjekt bezeichnet, mag man in der morphologischen Identität von akkad. Nominativ und Lokativadverbialis erkennen: beide werden mit dem Endmorphem */-u(m)/* gebildet(⁶¹).

Neben dem Bildungstyp *qatil*, der auch im Akkad. für den seltenen präterital-aktivischen Gebrauch vorbehalten ist, scheint es in Ebla (oder woher immer die betr. Personennamen stammen) für denselben Gebrauch schon den Bildungstyp *qatal(a)* gegeben zu haben;

(⁵⁷) Daß keine Nominalkonjugation “Richter ist...” vorliegt, zeigt das Vorhanden-Sein eines Part. *da-i-in*, das nur bei fientischen Verben vorauszusetzen ist. Zu akkad. *d(i)ānu(m)* mit der fientischen Bedeutung “richten” in Personennamen vgl. J. J. STAMM, “Namen rechtlichen Inhalts”, *Beiträge zur hebr. und altorientalischen Namenkunde*, 159-178, bes. 162.

(⁵⁸) Vgl. M. DAHOOD, “Linguistic Classification of Eblaite”, in: *La lingua di Ebla*, 177-189, bes. 184.

(⁵⁹) Vgl. dazu meinen Beitrag auf dem Convegno internazionale Napoli 1982 (Anm. 26).

(⁶⁰) Die Vermutung, daß nur die AK als ursprünglich nicht-aktive, tempusneutrale Nominalkonjugation, nicht aber die PK als aktivische, tendentiell transitive und (sekundär?) tempusdifferenten Verbalkonjugation der Ergativstruktur entspreche, wirft neue Fragen auf. Ist der akkad. status absolutus der Rest eines casus absolutus sowohl für das Subjekt nicht-aktivischer Konjugationen, als auch für den Akkusativ und Vokativ in einem Ergativsystem? Liegt der älteren sem. AK ein Substrat (Superstrat?) aus einer Ergativsprache zugrunde? In Konkurrenz zu einem anderen System steht das ergativische System auch in anderen Ergativsprachen, etwa im Georgischen; zum Sum. vgl. jetzt P. MICHALOWSKI, “Sumerian as an Ergative Language I”, *JCS* 32 (1980) 86-103 (freundlicher Hinweis von G. Wilhelm — Hamburg).

(⁶¹) Auch im Sum. scheint die Postposition *-e* für den Lokativ-Terminativ mit *-e* für den Agentiv identisch zu sein; vgl. A. FALKENSTEIN, *Das Sumerische* (HO I 2/1+2/1; Leiden 1964) 39.

dieser ist am ehesten von einem nomen agentis *qatal* abzuleiten⁽⁶²⁾ und hat mit den akkad. Dimensionsadjektiven nach *paras* und dem gleichlautenden Stativ von Zustandsverben offenbar nichts zu tun⁽⁶³⁾.

Das Problem einer Ableitung des präterital-aktivischen Gebrauchs der AK von deren ursprünglich tempusneutraler und nicht-aktivischer Funktion und einer Erklärung der Verwendung des Bildungstyps *qatal(a)* für die "perfektische" Bedeutung stellt sich also schon für einen wesentlich früheren Zeitpunkt, als bisher angenommen wurde; beides ist keine "jungsem. Neuerung", wie denn die betr. eblait. Bildungen auch an die gleichzeitige Verwendung des ägypt. Pseudopart. als "historisches Perfekt" erinnert, die schon im Mittel-ägypt. verschwindet⁽⁶⁴⁾. — Daß die präterital-aktivische Funktion der AK, die danach offenbar im ältesten Sem.-Ham. bekannt ist, im Akkad. wieder weitgehend fortfiel, hat seinen Grund im Streben nach Standardisierung und Symmetrie, das dem Akkad. auch sonst eigentümlich ist: der ursprüngliche ergativische Charakter der AK ist hier reiner herausgearbeitet worden. Die jung- oder westsem. Sprachen hätten dann auf präterital-aktivisches *qatal(a)* zurückgegriffen, das sie weitgehend an die Stelle der präterital-aktivischen PKKF *jaqtul/iprus* treten ließen: wo *qatal(a)* ganz oder fast ganz an die Stelle von *jaqtul* getreten ist wie im Aram., Phön.-Pun., Mittel- und Neuhebr. sowie Arab., war wieder ein Höchstmaß von Standardisierung der einzelnen Formbedeutungen und von Symmetrie des Systems erreicht. Das konservative Althebr. hat dagegen mit dem gleichzeitigen Gebrauch der AK als einer tempusneutralen und nicht-aktivischen Nominalkonjugation *qati/ul*, der bislang sog. AK 'neutrischer' oder 'intransitiver Verben', sowie als eines präterital-aktivischen Verbaltempus *qatal* eine frühe Multifunktionalität dieser Konjugationsart und mit dem wechselnden Gebrauch der präterital-aktivischen AK und der PKKF in der Erzählung eine alte Asymmetrie des Systems bewahrt.

3. Bekanntlich kann im Arab. der Infinitiv des G-Stamms (1. Stamms) noch durch sehr verschiedene Formen des nomen actio-

⁽⁶²⁾ Eine entsprechende *qatal*-Bildung im Eblait. ist: *ba-da-lum*, "Händler" (ARET 3, 340).

⁽⁶³⁾ Dagegen würde die Erklärung von *qatal* aus einer Umkehrung der phonematischen Opposition(en) *qati/ul* :: *jiqtal* bei Nominalkonjugationen gegenüber *jaqti/ul* :: **qital* bzw. **qutal* bei Verbalkonjugationen (BERGSTRÄSSER, *Hebr. Grammatik* 2, § 3f.) nicht auf *qatal* führen; der weitere Vokalaustausch **qital* bzw. **qutal* > *qatal* bedürfte einer zusätzlichen Begründung. Ein derivativer Zusammenhang zwischen der AK *paris* und der PKLF *iparras* / *jaqattal*, wie er früher gern angenommen wurde, ist ebenfalls problematisch: auch hier bedürfte die Differenz der Vokale einer zusätzlichen Begründung, da man von dem für akkad. Zustandsverben vorbehaltenen Thema *paras* nicht ausgehen kann.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Vgl. Vf., "Wie alt ist das jungsem. Perfekt? Zum sem.-ägypt. Sprachvergleich", demnächst in der *FS für W. Helck*.

nis vertreten werden⁽⁶⁵⁾; aber auch in anderen sem. Sprachen, etwa dem Akkad. und Hebr., gibt es neben dem standardisierten Inf., bei dem das Subjekt im Nominativ und das Objekt im Akkusativ stehen kann⁽⁶⁶⁾, eine Reihe weiterer Nomina-actionis-Typen ohne spezifisch verbale Rektion⁽⁶⁷⁾.

Im Eblait., über dessen nomina actionis wir durch die sum.-eblait. lexikalischen Listen in G. Pettinato, *Testi lessicali bilingui della biblioteca L. 2769* (MEE 4; Napoli 1982), unterrichtet sind, ist zunächst der nach *qatālu(m)* bzw. *qālu(m)* standardisierte Inf. besonders häufig. Diesem Bildungstyp entspricht akkad. *parāsu(m)* bzw. *kānu(m)*, letzteres im Unterschied zu Formen mit Doppelvokal wie *tiābu(m)* und assyr. *kuānu(m)*; im Hebr. entsprechen ihm einerseits seltene Inf. cs. wie *škab* "liegen" oder *špal* "niedrig sein"⁽⁶⁸⁾, andererseits der Inf. abs. wie *qātōl*⁽⁶⁹⁾ bzw. *qôm* bei den Verben II inf. Eblait. gehören hierher etwa *kú* = *a-kà-lu-um* "essen" MEE 4, Nr. 0191⁽⁷⁰⁾ (vgl. hebr. 'KL), *du₈^{ru}* = *ma-ḥa-lu-um* bzw. *ma-ḥa-lum* /*maḥārum*/⁽⁷¹⁾ "empfangen" 947, AN-UŠ = *a-ma-du-um* /*amādum*/ "stehen" 787 (vgl. hebr. 'MD), *al-dīb* = *ba-a-li(ḡ-a)* /*bār.* / "fangen" 986.028 und *ša-ḥul* = *za-a-rūm* /*zārum*/ "has-sen" 0366. — Die eblait. Verba II gem. bilden wie im Akkad., anders als im Hebr., starke Inf., etwa *nì-ku₅* = *ba-da-dum* "trennen" 105 u.a. Die eblait. Inf. der Verben III inf. sive gutt. gehen wie im Altakkad. und Assyrl., anders als im Babyl., nach *qatā'um*, etwa *al-gál* = *ba-ša-um* /*bašā'um*/ (gegenüber babyl. *bašū[m]*) "sein" 991, *pād* = *na-ba-um* "rufen, nennen" 725 (vgl. 325a) (hebr. NB'),

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Vgl. BROCKELMANN, a.a.O. § 263 Bb; J. M. SOLÁ-SOLÉ, *L'infinitif sémitique. Contribution à l'étude des formes et des fonctions des noms d'action et des infinitifs sémitiques* (Paris 1961).

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Auch im Akkad. ist diese Rektion die seltener verwirklichte Möglichkeit; vgl. W. VON SODEN, *Grundriß der akkad. Grammatik* (= GAG) (Acta Orientalia 33; Roma 1952) § 149c.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Auch das Ägypt. ist von einer großen Zahl von Nomina-actionis-Typen ausgegangen, die allmählich auf wenige Inf.-Formen reduziert worden sind; vgl. etwa W. SCHENKEL, *Die altägypt. Suffixkonjugation* (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 32; Wiesbaden 1975) 33.43.44/5.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Vgl. H. BAUER-P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebr. Sprache des AT* (= BL) (Nachdruck Hildesheim 1962) § 43f.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Vgl. arab. *qatālun* bei Intransitiven.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Zitiert wird nach den Synopsen MEE 4, 197ff.

⁽⁷¹⁾ Semivokalisches /r/ wird im Eblait. oft durch /l/-haltige Zeichen wiedergegeben; vgl. VF., *La lingua di Ebla*, 232; ferner *Bib* 62, 312^{35a}. 320⁷⁹.

giš-ba-taka = *sa-ma-um* /šamā'um/ "hören" 393 (hebr. ŠM')
u.v.a.

Neben Inf. mit /a/-Vokalismus scheint das Eblait. auch /i/-Inf. nach *qatilu(m)* oder *qatīlu(m)* zu kennen; doch ist zu fragen, ob /i/ nicht gelegentlich auf Ungenauigkeit der Schreibung zurückgeht⁽⁷²⁾ oder ein Part. vorliegt. Ist letzteres beides nicht der Fall, so haben wir es mit einem Analogon zu akkad. nomina actionis nach *pir-sum*⁽⁷³⁾ und vor allem zu "substantivischen Ersatzbildungen zum Inf. (des) G-Stamm(s)" wie *salīmu(m)* "Friede, Freundschaft", *šagīmu* "Gebrüll" u.ä.⁽⁷⁴⁾ zu tun; hebr. entsprechen diesem Bildungstyp u.a. Inf. nach *qil* bei Verben I:n oder *w* mit PK-Formen nach *jaqtil*, nämlich *tēt* "geben", *lādūt* bzw. *lēdā* "gebären" u.ä. (vgl. *qil* bei Verben II: *î*⁽⁷⁵⁾), ferner Verbalnomina nach *qatil* wie *gāzēl* / *gēzēlā* "Raub > Geraubtes", *hārēgā* "Töten, Schlachtung" u.ä.⁽⁷⁶⁾ oder *qatīl* wie *'āsīp* "Lese", *bāšīr* "Weinlese", *hāgīg* "Seufzen", *zāmīr* "Singen", "Schneiteln (der Reben)" Hld 2,12; Gezer-Kal. Z.6, *hārīš* "Pflügen", *qāšīr* "Ernte", *rākīl* "Verleumdung"; der Häufigkeitsbefund von *qatīl* bei der Bezeichnung von musikalischen und agrikulturellen Tätigkeiten wiederholt sich bei Bildungen mit "Fem.-Endungen" nur teilweise (*hālikā* "Gang", *hālīpā* "Wechsel, Auslösung", *hānīnā* "Erbarmen" u.a.)⁽⁷⁷⁾. Eblait. *qatil-* bzw. *qatīl-* Bildungen finden sich in *eme-bala* = *a-pi₅-lu-um* (neben *a-pā-lu-um*) "antworten(?)" 179, *eme-lā* = *ba-ti-mu(-um li-sa-nu)* "?" 180, *gēštu* = *ha-zi-zu-um* bzw. *ha-zi-zū* "Gehör, Weise-Sein" 389.085 und der von G. Pettinato⁽⁷⁸⁾ für den Typ *qatīl* genannten Bildung *pā-rī-su₁₁*, für die er allerdings keine Bedeutung angibt, sowie in *ù-di* = *si-tum* (neben *na-a-um*) "Schlaf" 1131.

Schließlich gibt es im Eblait. Inf. mit /u/-Vokalismus entsprechend akkad. *pursum* und hebr. Inf. cs. **qutul* > *qētōl* (bzw. *qūl* bei Verben II:ū und *qull* > *qōl* bei Verben II gem.); doch sind bei dreikonsonantigen Wurzeln Verwechslungen mit dem Inf. des D-Stamms

⁽⁷²⁾ Vgl. das Nebeneinander von *ma-za-gi-nūm* und *ma-zi-gi-nūm* für *giš-nī-gul* 494; ferner 407.807.

⁽⁷³⁾ Vgl. GAG § 55c.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Vgl. GAG § 55i.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ Zu nomina actionis nach *qil* und *qill* vgl. BL § 61q.d'.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ Vgl. BL § 61k'''. m''.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ Vgl. P. JOÜON, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique* (Roma 1923) § 88 Eb; BL § 61p^a-r^a.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Ebla, 69.

nach dem altakkad. und babyl. Bildungstyp *quttulum* nicht auszuschließen⁽⁷⁹⁾. Letzteres ist freilich bei dem nichttheophoren Element *du-bù-ḫu* “(Zeit des) Opfers” als Bezeichnung der Geburtsstunde in Personennamen der Struktur *du-bù-ḫu*+GN wenig wahrscheinlich; dazu kommen die folgenden Bildungen von Verben II inf.: šà-ki-ág = *du-du* (neben *tá-du-du*) “lieben” 584 (vgl. hebr. *dôd* “Geliebter” u.ä.), al-ug₆ = *a-li-a-mu-tù* “... sterben”⁽⁸⁰⁾ 985 (vgl. hebr. *MŪT*) und *tù-bi* “mein Gut”⁽⁸¹⁾ (vgl. hebr. *ṭôb* bzw. *ṭûb*).

Inf. mit /-(a)tum/ — offenbar nach Analogie der arab. nomina vicis nach *fa'lat^m* für die einmalige Ausführung einer Handlung⁽⁸²⁾ — sind im Eblait. ebensowenig wie bei den hebr. und akkad. nomina actionis⁽⁸³⁾ auf bestimmte Verbalklassen beschränkt. Eine entsprechende Bildung von einer Wurzel I:w mit Elision des 1. Radikals⁽⁸⁴⁾ ist *nì-tuš* = *šu-ba-tù/tum* “sitzen > Residenz” 88⁽⁸⁵⁾ (vgl. akkad. *šubtu[m]* mit Stammvokal /u/, dagegen hebr. *šābāt* mit Stammvokal /i/), womit *lú su-ba-ti* “maior domus(?)” MEE 2, 27 IV 6f. zu vergleichen ist. Bildungen mit /-(a)tum/ von Verbalklassen, die im Hebr. keinen “femininen” Inf. aufweisen, sind *zi* = *nu-pù-uš-tù-um/tum* “leben” von der dreikonsonantigen Wurzel *NPŠ* 1050.1315', *nì-du₁₀* = *tù-bù-tu* bzw. *tù-bù-a-tum* “gut sein” 61.0239; ein entsprechender Inf. des Š-Stamms scheint in *nì-è* = *šu-bù-ul-tum* “senden” von der Wurzel *WBL* 0245 vorzuliegen.

4. Das Part. (nomen agentis) des G.Stamms *qātilu(m)* geht wie in anderen sem. Sprachen durch Dehnung aus dem Bildungstyp *qatil*

⁽⁷⁹⁾ So kann man darüber streiten, ob *ḫu-lu-mu* in *izi-gar* = *ḫu-lu-mu* (G. PETTINATO, *AfO* 25 [1974] 30; vgl. dagegen MEE 4, Nr. 136.0139) und in der Monatsbezeichnung *itu ḫu-lu-mu* G- oder D-Stamm ist; die Schreibvariante *itu ḫur-mu* spricht für G-Stamm.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ *a-li-a* kann ich nicht erklären.

⁽⁸¹⁾ Bei PETTINATO, *Ebla*, 69.

⁽⁸²⁾ Vgl. W. FISCHER, *Grammatik des klassischen Arab.* (Wiesbaden 1972)

111.

⁽⁸³⁾ Zu den hebr. Inf. bzw. nomina actionis “mit Fem.-Endung” zum G-Stamm (Qal) vgl. BL § 61j (*qil-t*), q (*qil-at*), t (*qûl-at*), e' (*qill-at*), g' (*qull-at*), y' (*qatl-at*, *qitl-at*), l' (*qutl-at*), m''' (*qatil-at*), x''' (*qitil-at*), b^a-d^a (*qutul-at*), r^a (*qatîl-at*), x^a (*qatûl-at*), k^ß (*qitâl-at*); zu entsprechenden akkad. Bildungen vgl. GAG § 55c (*pirist*), d (*purust*) h (*parâst*).

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Die Elision bleibt aus bei einem Verb I:j wie *an-gál* = *i-sa-u₁₇(P₁)* “haben, vorhanden sein” 624 mit “assyrl. Vokalismus.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ Vgl. PETTINATO, *La lingua di Ebla*, 266.271; A. ARCHI, *StE* 2 (1980) 87.

für Adjektive hervor. Part. finden sich in *baḥar* = *wa-ši-lu-um* /*wāṣiṣum*/ "Töpfer" MEE 4, Nr. 1012 oder dem Personennamen bzw. Personennamen-Element 'à-lik "gehend", ein Adjektiv nach *qatil* dagegen in *a-si-ra-tum* "Hof-, Heiligtumsdame" (< *'šr) ARET 3, S. 337, wohinter sich offenbar die appellative Bedeutung des Gottesnamens 'trt = 'ašērā verbirgt.

Dem Altakkad.⁽⁸⁶⁾ und Assy. entsprechen Adjektive III inf. sive gutt. nach *qati'um*, Bildungen also möglicherweise ohne Dehnung des /a/ in der 1. Silbe, die nicht auf Verben zurückgeführt werden müssen, wie *ḥul* = *ba-ri-um* "dürftig" Nr. 718 (fem. *ba-ri-a-tum* ARET 3, 959 V 8), *nu-sar* = *kà-ri-um* "Gärtner" 1331' oder *muš-laḥ₄* = *ša-ri-um* "Schlangenbeschwörer" 740.

5. Auf Bildungen des G-Stamms mit *t*-Infix und auf die abgeleiteten Stämme soll hier nicht ausführlich eingegangen werden, da das Material dafür noch zu spärlich ist.

Lediglich auf einige "Assyrismen" möchte ich hinweisen, die möglicherweise die nordsem. Zugehörigkeit des Eblait. anzeigen. Prekativ (*lû* + PKKF) des D-Stamms liegt offenbar vor in der Kontextform *lu-ti-ir* "er möge zurückbringen" TM.75.G.2420 498⁽⁸⁷⁾; die Bildung mit *lû-* entspricht dem Assy. — im Gegensatz zu babyl. *lî-*⁽⁸⁸⁾. Beim Inf. des D-Stamms⁽⁸⁹⁾ scheinen Bildungen nach *qattu-lu(m)*, wie wir sie aus dem Assy. kennen, und solche nach dem im Altakkad.⁽⁹⁰⁾ und Babyl. geläufigen *quttulu(m)* nebeneinander zu stehen: ersteres liegt vor in den paronomastischen Ausdrücken *ù-na-ba-kà-ma na-bù-ù* "ich werde dich wahrlich (im Lobpreis?) nennen" TM.75.G.1444 XIII 12f.⁽⁹¹⁾ und *qá-tù-ru₁₂ u₉-qá-ṭa-ra* "er wird bestimmt Räucherungen vornehmen" ARET 2, 34 VIII 11 – IX 1⁽⁹²⁾, letzteres vielleicht in *dub ù-su-rí* "Edikttafel" von WŠR ARET 2,

⁽⁸⁶⁾ Vgl. etwa die Personennamen *Kà-ri-um*, *Na-bi-um*, *Qá-bi-um* oder *Ra-ḫi-um* u.ä.; GELB, MAD 2, 190.192.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ Vgl. E. SOLLBERGER, *StE* 3 (1980) 144. Sollbergers passivische Interpretation der Form widerspricht nicht nur der Bedeutung des D-Stamms, sondern auch dem Kontext: die Form hätte in diesem Fall zwei Subjekte (*giš-ti*, 20 *udu-udu*) und müßte pl. sein.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ Vgl. GAG § 81e.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ Nach welchem Selektionsprinzip in den lexikalischen Texten MEE 4 sum. Lexeme einmal mit eblait. Inf. des G-Stamms, ein andermal mit eblait. Inf. des D-Stamms wiedergegeben werden, ist bislang nicht kenntlich.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ Vgl. GELB, MAD 2, 174.

⁽⁹¹⁾ Vgl. EDZARD, *StE* 4 (1981) 43.53.

⁽⁹²⁾ Vgl. S. 124; doch könnte *u₉(BÀD)* = 'u_x auch für die 1.P. stehen.

32 XII 1f.⁽⁹³⁾ und in der Monatsbezeichnung *itu hu-lu-mu*, falls hier nicht G-Stamm anzunehmen ist⁽⁹⁴⁾. Ein Inf. des Š-Stamms nach Analogie von Assyr. *šaprusum* mag in *dim* = *sa-hu-sum* /*ša'ħuzum*/ "nehmen lassen" MEE 4, Nr. 056 vorliegen.

III.

1. Für eine Syntax des eblait. Verbs in Kontexten ist das Material ebenfalls noch zu spärlich⁽⁹⁵⁾. Eine genaue Durchsicht des von D. O. Edzard transkribierten und versuchsweise übersetzten Textes TM.75.G.1444, des Protokolls einer Art von Schenkung⁽⁹⁶⁾, bestätigte mir das Urteil W. von Sodens, daß die alte freie sem. Wortstellung die Satzteile nach ihrem Gewicht verteile⁽⁹⁷⁾, mit dem jeweils gewichtigsten Element am Satzanfang. Eine Reihe von Verbalsätzen beginnt mit dem Subjekt (V 9-14; XI 12; XII 4); insbesondere beim Texteingang (Exposition) begegnet die Konstruktion {Subjekt – Verbalprädikat – Adverbial}, die wir auch aus der ugar. Prosa kennen⁽⁹⁸⁾ (I 1-9; vgl. XVII 19 – XVIII 7); mehrfach findet sich auch die aus dem Akkad. vertraute Wortstellung {Subjekt – Objekt – Verbalprädikat} (XVII 8-13; XV 18 – XVI 2; vgl. in Nebensätzen III 14 – IV 2; XII 8-10). Auch Voranstellung des Objekts kommt vor (V 6-8; X 3-8 u.ö.).

2. In der Personennamengebung, deren Idiom möglicherweise als konservativ-sondersprachlich anzusehen ist, steht das Prädikat, soweit wir bis jetzt sehen, dagegen meist an erster Stelle.

Was speziell die konjugierten Prädikate angeht, so ist bei Verben in der PK deren Voranstellung sogar wie in vielen sem. Sprachen die Regel; auch die Prädikate in der AK stehen meist voran (*a-ba-il* "ein Vater ist II" neben der selteneren Struktur *lugal-a-ba*). – Bei den deklinierten Prädikaten scheint deren Voranstellung die älte-

⁽⁹³⁾ So ARCHI, *StE* 4, 154; anders EDZARD, *ARET* 2, 82.143.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ Vgl. Anm. 79.

⁽⁹⁵⁾ Vgl. zur Syntax, GELB, *La lingua di Ebla*, 42f.

⁽⁹⁶⁾ *StE* 4 (1981) 35-59.

⁽⁹⁷⁾ GAG § 130b.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ *UT* § 13.46.

re Struktur zu sein⁽⁹⁹⁾: dabei entspricht die Sequenz in *a-bù-il* "ein Vater ist Il", *a-bí-il* "mein V. ist Il", *ṭab-li-im* "gut ist Lim" u.ä. derjenigen von Prädikatswurzel und Pronominalelement in der ursprünglich als Nominalkonjugation verwendeten AK, etwa in akkad. *šarr-āku* "ein König bin ich" oder hebr. *qāṭal-tā* "ein Töter bist / warst du" > "du hast getötet".

Daneben gibt es bei deklinierten Prädikaten die für den Nominalsatz charakteristische Voranstellung des Subjekts⁽¹⁰⁰⁾: *NI-ra-mu* "GN ist erhaben" und *šum-ra-bu* "der (göttliche) Name / Nachkomme ist groß" neben Bildungen mit merkmallosem Prädikat wie *a-ḫu-ṭab* "der (göttliche) Bruder ist gut", *AN-na-im* "AN ist freundlich". Falls diese syntaktische Anordnung die jüngere ist, wäre auch die Subjekt-Prädikat(-Objekt)-Struktur des sem. Nominalsatzes eine relative Neuerung. Andererseits setzt die Struktur der PK *ja-qtul* u.ä. mit ihrer Voranstellung des die Person, das Genus und den Numerus des Handlungssubjekts anzeigenden Morphems gegenüber der Verbalwurzel eine Subjekt-Verbalprädikat-Struktur voraus; die Uneindeutigkeit des Präformativs macht hilfsweise Endmorpheme nötig, wobei Redundanz in Kauf genommen wird.

Je eindeutiger also der verbale Charakter einer Prädikation ist, um so unverzichtbarer scheint jedenfalls in historischer Zeit die Voranstellung des Prädikats zu sein. Der verbale Charakter einer Prädikation ist bei Bildungen mit PK-Formen und der Verbalprädikat-Subjekt-Struktur des Satzes am eindeutigsten. Dagegen ist in der AK als ursprünglicher Konjugationsart für Adjektive, die später auf Substantive mit beschreibender (prädikativer) Funktion ausgedehnt wurde, die Voranstellung des Prädikats im Satz schon nicht mehr zwingend. — Hat eine Prädikation dagegen eindeutig nominalen Charakter, so legt sich offenbar je später je mehr die Voranstellung des Sub-

⁽⁹⁹⁾ Ein Nominalsatz im Kontext mit Voranstellung des Prädikats ist offenbar: *dumu i-ti-a an-na lú nam-ku₅* "der Sohn des I. bin ich, der schwört" TM.75.G.1444 XIV 9-13.

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Nominalsätze im Kontext mit Voranstellung des Subjekts finden sich in der Liste TM.75.G.2420 1ff.: dabei wiederholt sich die Struktur ON₁ + ON₂ ... in *šu en eb-la^{ki}* "ON₁, ON₂ ... (ist) in der Hand des Herrschers Eblas"; Z. 240-244: *me-nu ni-sa₁₀ eb-la^{ki} in šu a-ṭbar¹-ṭsal¹^{ki}* "warum ist der Fürst (?) von Ebla in der Hand A.s?"; Z. 455-460: *dumu-nita A.BAR.SILA^{ki} ū-ma dumu-mí A.BAR.SILA^{ki} ir₁₁ eb-la^{ki}* "die Söhne A.s. und auch die Töchter A.s. sind Knechte Eblas"; SOLLBERGER, *StE* 3 (1980) 134f.139.144.

jekts nahe. Der nominale Charakter einer Prädikation war vielleicht bei den Bildungen mit der Nominativendung */-u/* (^dNI-*ra-mu*, *šum-ra-bu*) oder mit */-Ø/* (*a-ḥu-ṭab*) am eindeutigsten. Aber auch die Prädikate mit dem AK-Morphem der 3.P.m.sg. */-a/* haben ursprünglich nominalen Charakter: dieser zeigt sich am Ursprung des Morphems */-a/*, falls es mit dem Indikator eines Zustandsadjektivs als *casus praedicativus* identisch ist⁽¹⁰¹⁾.

Die prädikativen Allomorpheme */-u/* und */-a/*, deren semantische Differenz für das Eblait. nicht einmal zu vermuten ist, bereiten den späteren Gegensatz von Nominalsatz und Verbalsatz vor: Bildungen wie ^dNI-*ra-mu* und *šum-ra-bu* antizipieren den Nominalsatz; eine Bildung wie *a-ba-il* dagegen kann als Verbalsatz erscheinen, sobald die AK */aba/* nach Analogie eines Verbs verstanden wird. Im Grunde aber ist *a-ba-il* mit dem Prädikativindikator */-a/* genauso ein Nominalsatz wie *a-bù-il* oder *da-du-UD* "ein Geliebter ist Utu", worin die Prädikativfunktion von */ab/* nicht bezeichnet ist. Die Unterscheidung von Nominal- und Verbalsatz ist natürlich auch bei den Prädikaten mit */-Ø/* wie *a-ḥu-ṭab* u.ä. noch gegenstandslos.

Eine eindeutige syntaktische Opposition besteht also im Eblait. der Personennamen nur zwischen der Struktur {PK eines Verbs – Nomen} und {Nomen – Nomen mit */-u/*, */-a/* oder */-Ø/*}, wobei letztere auf die Reihenfolge ihrer Elemente noch nicht festgelegt ist. Allenfalls kann man die erste Struktur als Verbalsatz der Sprache eblait. Personennamen, die zweite Struktur als deren Nominalsatz bezeichnen. Der später gängige sem. Nominalsatz ergibt sich, wenn die zweite Struktur auf die hier gekennzeichnete Reihenfolge festgelegt und das Prädikat nur noch mit */-u/* oder */-Ø/* bezeichnet wird.

Hagentwiete 35
D-2083 Halstenbek
Bundesrepublik Deutschland

Hans-Peter MÜLLER

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ Vgl. im Arab. den prädikativen Akkusativ nach *kāna* "sein" und vergleichbaren Vollverben, den adverbialen Zustandsakkusativ in *Hāl*-Sätzen sowie den adnominalen Zustandsakkusativ in Appositionen (FISCHER, a.a.O. § 380-383). — Ist */-a/* als Morphem für den prädikativen Akkusativ älter als der Objekt-Akkusativ als Dependenz einer AK, so entspräche dies einem ursprünglich ergativischen Charakter der AK, der einen Objekt-Akkusativ noch ausschlosse.

SOMMAIRE

Comme l'éblaïte représente un stade archaïque des langues sémitiques, l'analyse de son système verbal permet d'espérer quelques déductions quant au système verbal de l'hébreu, plutôt conservateur. Un paradigme irrégulier des langues sémitiques les plus anciennes devient symétrie pour les plus récentes. Dans les noms propres éblaïtes domine la forme brève du prétérit de la conjugaison avec préformante, comme dans les noms hébreux, où le *yiqṭōl* n'est pas jussif; dans le contexte, on pense avoir trouvé des correspondants à l'imparfait consécutif hébreu. La conjugaison sans préformante contient, de toute évidence, à côté d'un emploi statif fréquent, un emploi du parfait. L'infinitif est représenté par différents types du «nomen actionis», avec des formes au féminin distribuées de façon irrégulière. Tout le système est imprégné d'«assyrismes». Des observations sur la syntaxe, également sur la différence entre phrase verbale et nominale, concluent l'article.

Christ and the Power of Choice (Mark 3,1-6)

There is a dearth of study of the Withered Hand: yet the six verses are full of problems. Previous writers⁽¹⁾ tackle them in stereotyped ways, ignorant of the Old-Testament background clamouring for attention. The laconic text gives here (as with Mark 5,7-13)⁽²⁾ evidence of therapy by an expert hand—but this remains gen-

(1) M. ALBERTZ, *Die synoptische Streitgespräche* (Berlin 1920) 5-16 (pre-Markan collection); E. LOHMEYER-W. SCHMAUCK, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (Göttingen 1956) 185-186; W. BEILNER, *Christus und die Pharisäer* (Vienna 1959) 31-37; R. HUMMEL, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium* (Munich 1963) 44-45; R. H. FULLER, *Interpreting the Miracles* (London 1963) 52-53 (a pronouncement story, Messianic); H. VAN DER LOOS, *The Miracles of Jesus* (Leiden 1965) 148, 436-440; H. MULDER, "Doden op de Sabbat" *Hom. Bib.* 25 (1966) 116-118; K. TAGAWA, *Miracles et Évangile* (Paris 1966) 11-12 (a *Streitgespräch*); E. HAENCHEN, *Der Weg Jesu* (Berlin 1968) 123-129; H. RIESENFELD, *The Gospel Tradition* (Oxford 1970) 118 (new creation); K. KERTELGE, *Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium* (Munich 1970) 82-85 (contradiction); A. J. HULTGREN, "The Formation of the Sabbath Pericope in Mk 2:23-28", *JBL* 91 (1972) 38-43 (two-stage development); A. DUPREZ, "Deux affrontements au jour du Sabbat..." *Assembl. Seign.* 40 (1972) 43-53 (eschatological liberation); J. ROLLOFF, *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus* (Göttingen 1973) 63-66, 73-74 (not a typical *Streitgespräch*); G. THEISSEN, *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten* (Gütersloh 1974) 114-116, 218-219, 249; D.-A. KOCH, *Die Bedeutung der Wundererzählungen für die Christologie des Markusevangeliums* (Berlin - New York 1975) 50-55 (about ἐξουσία); R. PESCH, *Das Markusevangelium I* (Freiburg 1976) 187-197 (the story need not have related to a Sabbath); J. GNILKA, *Das Evangelium nach Markus I* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) 124-132; C. DIETZFELBINGER, "Vom Sinn der Sabbatheilungen Jesu", *EvT* 38 (1978) 281-298 at 288-290; J. DEWEY, *Markan Public Debate* (SBL Diss. Ser. 48; Chico 1980) 100-106 (no *Streit*). For SAUER (1982) see n. 6 below. Which way is Mark research going? U. Luz, "Markusforschung in der Sackgasse?", *TLZ* 105 (1980) 641-655.

(2) J. D. M. DERRETT, "Spirit-possession and the Gerasene Demoniac", *Man* NS 14 (1978) 286-293; id., *Studies in the New Testament III* (Leiden 1982) 50, 52.

erally unknown. The passage is not entirely without humour, but that depends on the viewpoint. Mark has already used κύριος . . . καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου (2,28) in a double sense (Jesus is 'lord' even on the Sabbath⁽³⁾ and in any case the Sabbath is the Lord's), and we are ready to see the Lord embroiling himself with pseudo-partisans of his Sabbath. The last of the controversy passages leaves Jesus triumphant and, Mark implies, opposition has become not only inevitable but also equipped⁽⁴⁾. Mark achieves his object of blackening the Old Synagogue⁽⁵⁾. It has been argued⁽⁶⁾ that here we have no reality, but a reflection of 'heathen Christians' at war with 'Jewish Christians' notions of the Sabbath: but such arguments reinforce the danger of not knowing what the passage actually says.

Granted that Jesus cured a man with a paralysed hand, and tradition located this on a Sabbath, this must have had multiple significances for all concerned, then and later. How could an editor bring all these out, without intruding foreign matter? Let us first establish the Old Testament 'value' of the story as told—its 'verification' *in* and *of* the scripture common to the Old Synagogue and the church. Then we may explore the pericope's relation to the Hexateuchal 'grid' against which Mark seems to have compiled his gospel; for this could have affected the story's structure and vocabulary: it can hardly have been pegged in without some adaptation.

The questions that strike the hearer are these: Why is the hand 'dried up' rather than ῥικνός, νεκρωμένος, ἀδρανής, παράπληκτος,

(3) The Greek suggests the first (DERRETT, *Studies I* [Leiden 1977], 94) but Mark produced a double meaning. M. TSEVAT, "The basic meaning of the biblical Sabbath", *ZAW* 84 (1972) 447-459 at 454-455.

(4) PESCH, *Markus*, 190.

(5) W. SCHRAGE, "'Ekklesia' und 'Synagoge'", *ZTK* 60 (1963) 178-202 (*synagoge* is firmly associated with the Redemption from Egypt).

(6) J. SAUER, "Traditionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu Mk 3.1-6", *ZNW* 73 (1982) 183-203. ROLOFF, *Kerygma*, 64, and PESCH, *Markus*, 195, take the episode to be historically reliable. So E. LOHSE, "Jesu Worte über den Sabbat", in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche* (BZNW 26; FS. J. Jeremias [ed. W. ELTESTER] Berlin 1960) 70-89 at 85. M. WAIBEL, "Die Auseinandersetzung mit der Fasten- und Sabbat-praxis Jesu in urchristlichen Gemeinden", *Quaes. Disp.* 87 (1979) 63-96 (conservative). H. BRAUN, *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristliche Radikalismus II* (Tübingen 1951) 70 n. 1, KOCH, *Bedeutung*, 51-52, and GNILKA, *Markus*, 125, are sceptical.

etc.? Why is the man not introduced by friends, etc. (cf. Mark 9,17-18); why is there no conversation (cf. 5,7-13)? We have a gratuitous miracle. Why *in* a synagogue (cf. 5,22.27-28)? Why the *watching* of Jesus (is this redactional)? Why in the *middle* (are we to watch the 'middle' as they did)? The rhetorical question of v.4 (was it rhetorical?) overflows with problems hitherto solved tortuously and unconvincingly. No one was offering, at that point, to save a life or to kill. Matthew and Luke were set off on tedious halakhic disquisitions: their attempted solution. Why the *silence*? Why does Jesus experience *anger* (the so-called [pseudo-] biographical interest)? Did he comically *evade* Sabbath taboos by calling for a non-transitive action on the man's part (cf. John 5,8)? How was the hand *restored*? Does the miracle conclude some halakhic debate (rabbis eventually denied that a miracle could)(7); or does it provoke Pharisees into sin (a trap for trap-setters: Ps 7,15)? If we pursue our two paths separately all questions are solved.

The key words are συναγωγήν; εἰσῆλθεν (1) contrasted with ἐξελθόντες (6); ἐξηραμμένην (1)/ ξηράν (3) contrasted with ἔκτεινον, ἐξέτεινεν; χεῖρα (1.5 [twice]); τοῖς σάββασιν *θεραπεύσει* (a word of magnificent biblical ambiguity: see Mark 2,17 par.); ἔγειρε; ἔξεστιν is a link backwards with 2,24.26; σῶσαι and ἀπεκατεστάθη contrasted with ἀπολέσωσιν (6); and of course the emphatic ἔκτεινον, ἐξέτεινεν. The most important word is the ambiguous χεῖρ (= *yād*) (hand and/or arm); the next most emphatic idea is 'dry'. The 'opposition' leave the synagogue at the moment when it is freed from paralysis, they therefore champion paralysis on the Sabbath! It is only unintentionally that they spread their belief (3,2) in Jesus' miraculous powers, and the contrast with 1,45(8) is all but laughable. The Jewish public follows Jesus (7) and others are drawn to him (8) not to the synagogue, nor to the 'opposition'. Jesus remains the master of the field.

(7) THEISSEN, *Wundergeschichten*, 114-115 (references). *y.Mo'ed* III. 1, *b.B.Meṣ.* 59b.

(8) W. WREDE, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (Göttingen 1901) 53. It is quite obvious that εἰς τὸ μέσον (3,3) refutes, here, any question of secrecy. The *man* is given maximum "exposure", and the *synagogue* receives "treatment" in him.

Explication of the Pericope

1. 'Dried up'. True, he whose strength is dried up is as good as dead (Ps 22,15) but that is an exaggeration and the man was not likely to die before sunset, as everyone has noticed. Χεῖρ can indeed mean arm including hand⁽⁹⁾ and we do well to consider the very wide range of complaints which could produce such a condition⁽¹⁰⁾. One thing we know: the hand or arm had been normal (ἀπεκατεστάθη 5e). Paralysis will eventually lead to wasting of muscular tissue, *whatever its cause*. The word ξηρός is used of paralysis irrespective of marked shrivelling⁽¹¹⁾. 'Shrivelling'⁽¹²⁾ is not the death of a limb, which would require amputation (known to the ancients). One cause of paralysis (and therefore, in time, wasting)⁽¹³⁾ is known to the Bible, and to the world at large, as susceptible to charismatic cure⁽¹⁴⁾. An ounce of experience is worth a ton of theory. In 1944 I attended (as radiographer) a case of what was then called a 'functional' disorder, now well-known as 'conversion symptoms', a sub-department of 'hysteria'. The patient had a severe religious mania, and I examined him for a possible orthopaedic lesion. He was anaesthetised with Pentathol, his affected arm was repeatedly flexed and extended and no lesion appeared. The arm was left extended; on his regaining consciousness he at once flexed his arm and insisted it could not be extended—which indeed neither

(9) LAMPE, *Patr.Gk.Lex.*, s.v., esp. 6,9. Lev 21,19. *ṭṣillīn ha-yād* are phylacteries of the arm. *madbēqē yadīn* are armpits. See *t. Šabb* VIII.29.

(10) Dr F. L. W. Collings (Salisbury) with the aid of an orthopaedic surgeon colleague lists organic possibilities (congenital factors are eliminated by the text): (a) trauma, e.g. burns, wounds from stabs or fractures, in particular Volkmann's ischaemic contracture (due to arterial damage in the arm), or ligaturing, (b) infection such as poliomyelitis or leprosy, (c) degenerative diseases inclusive of strokes (unlikely here), and localised nerve degenerations due to growths, deficiency diseases, or, e.g. diabetes. But if the suggestion is that the hand alone is paralysed, and trauma is excluded, quite other considerations arise (see below).

(11) See uses of ἡμίξηρος (victim of supposedly demonic "stroke"), ἐξηράνθη as explained by S. LIEBERMAN at *JQR* 35 (1944) 53-55. D. C. HESSELING, "Ξηρός", in *Sertum Nabericum... Batavis* (Leiden 1908) 145-154.

(12) "Dried" means "shrivelled": *b. Giṭ.* 69b (Soncino trans., 330).

(13) M. SIM, *Guide to Psychology* (Edinburgh 1981) 299.

(14) Here I would locate Tacit., *Hist.* IV 81; Philostr., *Vit. Ap.* III 39 (method unclear).

he nor his attendants could achieve without anaesthetising him. He was consigned to a mental ward. These conditions⁽¹⁵⁾, sufficiently rare in peace time and amongst *men*, suit patients under exceptional stress, from which neither physical nor mental means of escape has appeared.

Though healing an *arm* is more dramatic, and the shrivelling of a hand less alarming, the sociological significance of a paralysed hand (especially the right hand) is very great. It is certainly possible for a hand to be affected by a conversion neurosis, since the latter does not observe neurological patterns, and a hand may become useless though the upper and fore-arm are still active. The mind believes the hand is a unit, and the hysteria follows this belief, not reality! Deformities are usually hidden, but did the man aim to hide his malady? It is a form of exhibitionism, pathetic enough. Sufferers from 'conversion symptoms' do *not* clamour to be cured. When the congregation stood for prayer, raising both hands to shoulder height, palms outwards, in the *orans* position familiar to us from the Dura Europos frescoes and elsewhere⁽¹⁶⁾, the man would immediately be detected. He was a matter of chagrin to his social group. He was proof of unconfessed sin (Ps 32,1-5), such as had not escaped the Almighty's attention. His society then before God was withered by reason of his shrivelling!

2. *The man in the synagogue* is asked to come out into the middle. This (i) dramatises the fact that the synagogue, including Pharisees, harbours him, and (ii) gives him the publicity and significance he has been deprived of (see below). Would more and better *observances* cure the man's unresolved problem, or exacerbate it? Jesus

(15) T. R. DETRE and H. G. JANECKI, *Modern Psychiatric Treatment* (Philadelphia - Toronto 1971) 222-226; J. H. WILLIS, *Clinical Psychiatry* (Oxford 1976) 210-216; A. THORLEY and R. STERN in *Essentials of Postgraduate Psychiatry* (ed. P. HILL et al.) (London - New York 1979) 216-222; J. C. NEMIAH in *Harvard Guide to Modern Psychiatry* (Cambridge, Mass. - London 1978) 182; J. B. IMBODEN et al., *Practical Psychiatry in Medicine* (New York 1978) 173; J. M. LUDWIG, *Principles of Clinical Psychiatry* (New York - London 1980) 185-193, 196; A. E. SLABY et al., *Clinical Psychiatric Medicine* (Philadelphia 1981) 382. VAN DER LOOS, *Miracles*, 439 (only hypotheses!).

(16) See the illustrations of the Dura frescoes in the *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1971) s.v., dictionaries of Christian archaeology, and, e.g. illustrations 45,88 in E. STAUFFER, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Stuttgart 1948). See Theodore of Studios, *or.* 9 (PG 99,777 C).

is not a *member* of that synagogue: the question, and they, confront him. The hand is very suggestive especially in a synagogue⁽¹⁷⁾ and on the Sabbath. *Yād* has a curious under-sense, of which we must take notice, though not dwell on it. By way of the euphemism for male genitals⁽¹⁸⁾ 'hand' means potency and a paralysed hand suggests impotence. Technically absence of a 'name' —which a sufferer from 'conversion symptoms' lacks (for he cannot resolve a psychological conflict which turns in upon him): that is the image conjured up. A sterile person is a wasting asset, a threat to his unit. Such a situation arose due to sin (see below) and no less a prophet than Isaiah asserted that an esoteric cure was available for it, certainly well known⁽¹⁹⁾. Let us consult Isa 56,1-5.

Thus says YHWH: Keep justice and do righteousness, for soon my salvation will come, and my deliverance (LXX ἔλεος) be revealed. Blessed is the man who does this and the son of man who holds fast to it, who *keeps the Sabbath*, not profaning it, and keeps his *hand* from doing *evil*. Let not the son of a stranger who has attached himself to YHWH say, "YHWH will surely exclude me from his People", nor let the eunuch say, "Behold, I am a *dried-up tree* (cf. the promise at Ezek 17,24)". For thus says YHWH, "To the eunuchs who keep my Sabbaths and *choose* (ἐκλέξωνται) what pleases me and cling to my Covenant, I will give, in my *house* and within my *walls*, a *hand* and a name better than sons and daughters...". Paralysis of a 'hand' can be cured by the 'eunuchs' (including metaphorical eunuchs)⁽²⁰⁾ making the right choice. They will become (what they had not been: Deut 23,1) full members of a synagogue. YHWH strikes and YHWH heals (Deut 32,39; Hos 6,1)

(17) Josephus, *Ant.* 4.291: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ πᾶν τὸ νομιζόμενον τέρας τοῖς ὁρώσι.

(18) Cant 5,4 is well known, Isa 57,8 less so. E. ULLENDORFF, , "The bawdy Bible", *BSOAS* 42 (1979) 425-456 at 441-442. The word is so rendered by ULLENDORFF at 1QS VII. 13. Isa 57,10, Qoh 11,6 (cf. 5), and Wisd 3,14 need re-examination. *b. Yebam.* 62b. I. B. SINGER, *Short Friday* (London 1967) 27. I. RAPAPORT, *The Hebrew Word Shem* (Melbourne 1976).

(19) Rabbinical encomia of Sabbath observance climax with Isa 56,1-7 and 58,13-14. See, e.g., *b. Šabb.* 118b (Soncino 582). Moore, *Judaism*, ii.24-25. Jos., *Ant.* 17.44-45.

(20) *b. Sanh.* 93b (Soncino 628). L. GINZBERG, *Legends of the Jews VI* (Philadelphia 1959) 415 n.78. What are we to say of the case of Abraham?

and healing is the property of a forgiving God⁽²¹⁾. See especially Gen 20,3,17-18.

Paralysis betrays a synagogue's sin: Deut 28-30. Dried-up members are one of the plagues with which obstinately disobedient Jews are cursed: Deut 28,20 is reinforced by 28,32 *w'e'ên le'êl yādeka*: thy hand is not for power/God = an absence of good works (*Frg. Tg.*, *Tg. Ps.-J.*); God will not be at your hands (*Tg. Neof.*), cursed with impotence (Philo, *Praem.* 140, cf. 146)⁽²²⁾. The man proves that Deut 28,16-46 has taken effect. So in Mark 9,18 (ξηραίνεταί) where the same diagnosis is to be made⁽²³⁾. A withered arm is a divine punishment: 1 Kgs 13,4-6; Isa 37,27 LXX (ἀνῆκα τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ἐξηράνθησαν) (*qisrēy yād* = impotent), and we can suspect this wherever 'dried up' appears (John 5,3,8-9; 9,7). The incident at Test. Sim. 2,12-13 (δεξιὰ ἡμίξηρος ... ἀποκαταστήσῃ) is proof of the idea; and it is found in the Jerusalemite Talmud⁽²⁴⁾. Our synagogue has evidently made the wrong *choice*: they are unable, in him, to make further choices. Hence their silence (cf. Ps 31,17-18).

3. *The absence of debate* fits a rebuke, incapable of reply. Jesus repels unvoiced criticism by his own critique. The synagogue are not in sackcloth and ashes; they pray for no cure of this man (Gen 20,7): see Acts 2,37-38; 8,24, and contrast Rev 16,9. Their ancestors had replied in terms of Exod 19,8: 'All that YHWH has spoken we will do' (see Exod 24,3,7; Deut 5,27-29). They hear the majestic midrash on Deut 30,15 and they cannot hide (as we have done) behind the pretext that the verse is irrelevant (see below). YHWH *would* be angry. Jer 8,1-3 seems to apply literally.

⁽²¹⁾ 2 Kgs 20,8; Ps 41,4; Isa 6,10; 19,22; 57,18; Jer 3,22; 17,14; 30,17; Hos 14,4.

⁽²²⁾ Notice παραπληξία (ambiguous) at Deut 28,28 (LXX) and cf. Luke 6,11 (ἀνοΐας). See also Deut 28,19 (*Tg. Neof.*).

⁽²³⁾ DERRETT at ZNW 73 (1982) 67 (a propos of Deut 32). Mark likes ξηραίνω: J. LAMBRECHT, at *L'Évangile selon Marc* (BETL 34; [ed. M. SABBÉ] Gembloux 1974) 299 n. 140.

⁽²⁴⁾ *y. Ta'an.* III. 66d (on *m. Ta'an.* III. 8). M. SCHWAB, *Talmud de Jérusalem* VI (Paris 1883) 172. Hos 9,16 may be referred to the same idea.

4. *The pseudo-halakhic question* has caused much needless speculation. Jesus is *not* referring to his personal danger!⁽²⁵⁾ He speaks in the idiom of *saving a soul*, well known to his audience, then and now⁽²⁶⁾. The word ἔξεστιν is precisely the Mishnaic Hebrew word *mûttâr*, which does not mean 'permitted' in legalistic terms, but precisely 'free from restriction' (root *NTR*). Mark 3,4bc should be rendered, 'Is it at our entire discretion, on the Sabbath, to do good *or* to do evil, (e.g.) to save a soul, *or* to slay it?' The word ἀποκτεῖναι is a variant of ἀπολέσαι, and though it is evidenced⁽²⁷⁾ no emphasis is to be placed on Mark's choice except in so far as it proves (see below) the midrash itself. The question as we have it is a midrash on Deut 30,15 presupposing a continuation into 30,19, without actually citing the latter. The two verses were conventionally, as for centuries later, read together⁽²⁸⁾, the result being thus: "See I have set before thee today Life and Good, and Death and Evil... choose Life." Every word of 30,15 concerns us: *re' ēh nātātî l'fāneykā hayôm 'et-haḥayîm we' et-ha'ôv we' et-hamāwet we' et-hārā'*. On the four key words an '*al-tiqrēy*' ('Read not X but Y') presents itself but the exegesis is really purely moral, and it is unique. *Action* is called for in 15 as we see by reading it with 30,16.19-20: action that can be indirect or direct, transitive or intransitive. Four different exe-

(25) PESCH, *Marcus*, 194 and n. 3, contradicts numerous scholars who assume that Jesus refers to the man's predicament. This misunderstanding derives from a harmonising tendency, and confusion introduced by Matthew and Luke. It is only indirectly that Jesus refers to the man and his duty in regard to him.

(26) Ps 56,13; Prov 23,13-14 (LXX); Mark 8,35; Matt 10,39; 15,25; Luke 9,24.56; John 12,25. Matt 8,22/Luke 9,60. G. DAUTZENBERG, *Sein Leben Bewahren. Ψυχή in den Herrenworten der Evangelien* (Munich 1966) 154-161 wrongly distinguishes our passage from the above. Jesus applies his mind to the man's everlasting life, for the hand shows it is endangered.

(27) Ezek 13,19 (cf. 18c). Matt 10,28 (but see whole verse). Cf. Ps 25,9 (LXX). The divine characteristic is given at Dan 6,37a (LXX): ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ ζῆν ποιῆσαι, and this supports "ἀποκτεῖναι" which equals *hāmēt*.

(28) Philo, *Quod Deus* 50; Justin, *1 Apol.* 44.1; *Const. Apost.* VII. 1 (init.); Cyprian, *Test.* III. 52 (PL 4.790). By an oversight S. SCHULZ, "Markus und das Alte Testament", *ZTK* 58 (1961) 193, and thence A. SUHL, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh 1965) 95, deny it.

geses lie within the verse, but we need to check the correspondences and then their order:

haḥayîm › *haḥʿyôt* › *lʿhaḥʿyôt nefes̄* (2 Kgs 5,7; Isa 38,16) = ψυχὴν
σῶσαι (cf. *m. ʿAb.* 4,22).

haṭôv › *hēyṭîv* › *lʿhēyṭîv* (Lev 5,4) = ἀγαθοποιῆσαι⁽²⁹⁾.

hamāwet › *hāmēt* › *lʿhāmēt* (Deut 32,39) = ἀποκτεῖναι.

hārāʿ › *hārēʿa* › *lʿhārēʿa* (Lev 5,4 *lʿhāraʿ*) = κακοποιῆσαι.

Yet this is not the *order* of Christ's words, though we have tracked them down. The most ancient midrash on 30,15 is found in the LXX, who, to emphasise the relation with 30,19, rearranged the order, to produce τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον, τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ κακόν, which their successors did not 'correct'. Rightly. Jesus simply reverses the pairs (Sir 33,14). Tradition insists that the words of 15 do *not* imply a free choice, for 19 restricts it! The word 'today' does not imply that the choice was made only at Mt. Sinai; each day the choice must be made anew (thus one must be merciful, etc. Prov 8,35)⁽³⁰⁾. Christ reminds the synagogue of Deut 30,15.19 and only one answer is acceptable to him: "*Not least on the Sabbath we are positively obligated to choose the good, which means favouring life both for this world and the next.*" If they fail, Deut 30,17-20 itself indicates the consequences. If they do not 'hear' they shall perish, walking in stubbornness of heart (*šʿrîrôt lēv*). YHWH's anger will activate Deut 28, and their *name* shall be blotted out. Jews are absolutely bound to *choose life* (see Isa 65,2; Deut 33,47; 2 Esd 7,59[129]), and the Jewish notion that by the Law the World to Come can be attained and that the word 'good' means rewards of doing good is naturally refuted in Christian circles (Gal 3,21; Rom 8,2-4). The wrong choice leads to hell, and Jesus' programme is to induce the right choice (cf. John 10,10).

⁽²⁹⁾ This is the correct reading (HUCK-GREEVEN, ¹³*Synopse*, 1981, § 82), ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι, though well supported, being a 'correction'. 'Good' suggests God (Matt 19,17) the doer of Good: Pss 25,8; 100,5; 119,68; 125,4. The correct Greek εὐεργετεῖν was also possible: Acts 10,38 used it of Jesus, "healing".

⁽³⁰⁾ R. Tobiah bar Eliezer, *Pʿsîqtaʿ zûṭarʿtaʿ* (in spite of its name, a major collection), ed. S. BUBER, *Midraš Leqah Tōv* (Wilna 1880), V, 103 (52a); trans. UGOLINI, *Thesaurus XVI* (Venice 1754), col. 1132.

One might object, as perhaps Pharisees did, that Deut 30,15.19 have no direct relevance to the paralysed man⁽³¹⁾. But what of 14, the previous verse? “For *near* to you is the Word, extremely, in your *mouth* and in your *heart in order to the doing of it*.” The major manuscripts of the LXX render... ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου αὐτὸ ποιεῖν, proving that once the Hebrew text was very reasonably⁽³²⁾ glossed with *ûbēyādekā* (and in your hand[s]), which promised that the commandment to love God (vv.10, 16) would be in their *hands* also: thus the cure of such a man was actually presupposed in the very next verse to that upon which Jesus wove his own midrash.

Now the learned members of the synagogue could have replied correctly (Am 5,13), for a pattern of their reply was offered by the inspired Ben Sirach, who put the Deuteronomic text into other words. We fortunately have Sir 15,13-20 in two Hebrew versions as well as the Greek⁽³³⁾.

The Lord hates all vice; it cannot be loved by such as fear him. He made man in the beginning and left him in the hand of his own *counsels*. If you choose, you can keep the commandments: it is faithfulness/understanding to do his will. He has set before you fire and water; *stretch out your hands* (ἐκτενεῖς τὴν χεῖρά σου) and take your preference: before man lie *life* and *death* (Deut 30,15; Am 5,14) and whichever he delights in is his. For in his great wisdom and mighty power the Lord sees everything. He keeps watch over those

(31) DEWEY, *Debate*, 102. It was the opinion of G. SCHILLE, *Die urchristliche Wundertradition* (Stuttgart 1967) 30-31, that the question far exceeded the case which arose before them all. So it did, but it raised the general issue, to which even the Sabbath must be subject.

(32) Philo, *Post.* 85-88; *Mut.* 237-238; *Somn.* ii 180; *Virt.* 183. Is not *talking* enough?! Rom 10,9-10! *b. Er.* 54a; *Exod.R.* XLVII. 4 (Sonc. 538); *Deut. R.* VIII. 6 (Sonc. 155). The Law itself is a remedy: *Deut. R.* VIII. 4, X. 1! Revisers of the LXX let this gloss stand (FIELD, *Hexapla* I, 317). There is strong evidence (*Gos. Thom.* 3, POxy 654.2 [HUCK-GREEVEN, *Synopse*, 173] that Jesus used a midrash on Deut 30,11-14 (as at Rom 10,6-10; 1 Bar 3,29-30) which surfaced in the saying at Luke 17,21 (T. F. GLASSON, *ExpTim* 78, 1966/7, 151-152).

(33) Y. YADIN, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem 1965); A. A. DI LELLA, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach* (The Hague 1966); F. VATTIONI, *Ecclesiastico* (Naples 1968) 76-77; H. P. RÜGER, *Text und Textform im hebräisch-sirach* (Berlin 1970).

that fear him; he takes notice of every work of man. He commanded no man to be wicked, nor has he given licence to commit sin. He does not love him who does evil...

Is it strange that Jesus cured the paralysed man, when he could have left them all to their fate (cf. Acts 18,6)? Deut 30,15 gives the answer. One chooses life, and to save a soul. The *man* must opt for Life, when *Jesus* may effectuate his option. Both are obligated, reciprocally. The curse at Deut 28 is reversible for Jesus represents the Healer.

5. *Jesus' anger and grief* do not relate to emotional 'input' in miracle-working (cf. Mark 7,34), but are theological in tendency; they are not negative in outcome. God grieves at past wrong choices (Gen 6,6; Ps 95,10; Isa 63,9-10); those that do evil grieve others (*ra' le* = to grieve)⁽³⁴⁾; and Jesus may share God's anger⁽³⁵⁾ as denounced innumerable times in the past (Num 11,1; five times in Deut 29; Ps 95,11). Jews might gloat on YHWH's curses upon the wicked⁽³⁶⁾ but Jesus does not leave matters there. Damaged flesh may be restored by a forgiving God: Exod 4,7 (cf. Num 12,13-16 MT, *Tg. Ps.-J.*, 2 Kgs 5,14-15). YHWH had cursed the synagogue in that man, but Jesus heals him. Jesus arrogates to himself the divine activity and as in many of his parables, his ministry silently extends divine processes⁽³⁷⁾. If the man truly honours the Sabbath and makes the right choice (even secretly) healing is possible. The stubbornness of heart, equivalent to blindness⁽³⁸⁾, is, as we saw from Deut 29,18, a crucial factor. The Jew congratulates himself on his 'peace', in spite of the curse, walking in *šerîrôt lēv* (*ŠRR*, to be hard), which will sweep away the moist and the dry, i.e. the inno-

⁽³⁴⁾ *b.B.M.* 84b.

⁽³⁵⁾ H. D. BETZ, ed. *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden 1978) 165, 179. J. SMIT SIBINGA, "Toorn en drefheid in Marcus 3,5. Ein bijdrage aan het Corpus Hellenisticum», *De Geest en het geding* (FS. J. A. Oosterbaan; [ed. I. B. HORST] Alphen/Rijn 1978) 255-267.

⁽³⁶⁾ Philo, *Praem.* 143-146.

⁽³⁷⁾ This awaits systematic study. See P. B. PAYNE, "The authority of the parables of Jesus", *Gospel Perspectives II* (ed. R. T. FRANCE and D. WENHAM) (Sheffield 1981) 329-344.

⁽³⁸⁾ Deut 29,4. *πῶρωσις* and *πῆρωσις* interchange as readings. J. A. ROBINSON, *JTS* 3 (1902) 81-93. K. L. and M. H. SCHMIDT, *TWNT* V 1029. Denied by Erb (below).

cent and the guilty (LXX). This phrase is open to be taken literally: the normal and the paralytic! But the Targums take it metaphorically, the blindly self-confident will add *presumption*, wilful wickedness, to ignorance. So stubbornness of heart (Mark 6,52, 8,17)⁽³⁹⁾, familiar as refusal of obedience to God and a cause of his just anger (Ps 95,8; Jer 3,17; 9,13; 16,12; cf. 18,12, etc.), does indeed couple the ignorant with the presumptuous. It is certain that in some eyes the cliché *šerîrût libām* (πώρωσις τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν) fitted the morality prevailing before Jesus' time, for the Qumran sect used it constantly⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Mark does *not* provide any halakhic discussion of healing on the Sabbath; this is *denied* as the real issue! One must penetrate behind the occasion and see its real significance. On the Sabbath one must make the right choice. But if they manifest stubbornness of heart they automatically become involved in plots, for Ps 81,12 says so: 'So I let them go after the stubbornness of their hearts, that they might walk in their own *counsels* (*mô'asôtêhem*, cf. 'ēšâ below)⁽⁴¹⁾.

6. *Extending the arm, stretching out the hand*⁽⁴²⁾, projects the hand, so that it may grasp, reject, or inflict power. It is a biblical cliché. It may be neutral, implying 'undertaking' (Deut 12,7.18; 15,10 etc.), but otherwise it has two semantic areas, good and evil. Man as image of God does a lot of hand-stretching-out! In the list which follows the allocations are tentative, the main distinction certain.

A. *Beneficial acts (twelve).*

	By Man	By God
i. Welcome		Isa 65,2
ii. Offer of friendship	Prov 1,24 (ἐξέτεινον)	
iii. Salute	Acts 26,1 (ἐκτείνας)	

⁽³⁹⁾ M. ERB, *Porosis und Ate* (Tübingen 1964) 5-6, would make it to be deliberate animosity (*sed quaere?*). L. CERFAUX, "L'aveuglement d'esprit", *Muséon* 59 (1946) 269ff. F. HESSE, *Das Verstockungsproblem im Alten Testament* (BZAW 74; Berlin 1955) 16 (on Isa 6,9-10 see 60-79). A. HERMANN, "Das steinharte Herz", JAC 4 (1961) 77ff at 90-94. K. BERGER, "Hartherzigkeit und Gottes Gesetz...", *ZNW* 61 (1970) 1-47.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ I QS I. 6; II. 14,26; III. 3; V. 4; VII. 19,24; IX. 10; CD II. 17; III. 5,11; XIX. 20. The point is taken by GNILKA, *Markus*, 128.

⁽⁴¹⁾ "Counsels" has a negative aroma: Ps 5,10; Prov 1,31; Hos 11,6.

⁽⁴²⁾ An Israeli doctor asks one to hold out the hand (*yād*), not the arm (*zērô'a*).

iv. Miracle	Exod 10,21 (ἐκτεινον); 14,21	Jer 22,17
v. Pray	Exod 9,33 (ἐξέτεινε); Pss 44,20, 68,31, 134,2; 143,6; Isa 1,15; 4 Macc 4,11; 1 Tim 2,8	
vi. Swear	Gen 14,22 (ἐκτενῶ)	Exod 6,8 (ἐξέτεινα); Num 14,30; Deut 32,40; Neh 9,15 (cf. Exod 13,5.11)
vii. Give alms	Prov 31,20 (ἐξέτεινε); Sir 7,32; 14,13; 31,20; Qoh 11,6	
viii. Bless	Gen 48,14 (ἐκτείνας); Luke 24,50	Jer 1,9(?)
ix. Save	Gen 19,10 (ἐκτείναντες); Exod 14,26 (in effect); 1 Chr 13,91; Matt 14,31	Exod 6,6; Deut 4,34; 5,15; 1 Kgs 8,42; 2 Chr 6,32; 2 Kgs 17,36; Pss 118,16; 136,12; 138,7; Isa 50,2, 59,1; Ezek 20,33-34.
x. Heal		Acts 4,30 (ἐκτείνειν)
xi. Accept	Gen 8,9 (ἐκτείνας); Exod 4,4; Jdg 3,21; 14,15; 2 Kgs 6,7; Ezek 10,7; Sir 4,31; 31,14.19; 50,15	Ezek 8,3
xii. Avenge		Ps 10,12 (LXX ὑψωθήτω)

B. Harmful acts (eight).

xiii. Defy	Job 15,25	
xiv. Hostile gesture	1 Kgs 13,4 (ἐξέτεινεν); 2 Sam 18,12; Ps 55,20; Lk 22,53; 1 Macc 7,47	
xv. Aggression, vengeance	Gen 22,10 (ἐξέτεινεν); Sir 46,2	Ps 138,7 (ἐξέτεινας); Isa 5,25; 23,11; Jer 6,12; 15,6; 51,25; Sir 36,3.6
xvi. Quarrel	Prov 30,32	
xvii. Attack	Deut 25,11 (ἐκτείνασα); 1 Sam 24,6.10; 26,9.11.23; 2	Exod 3,20 (ἐκτείνας); 7,5; 9,15;

	Sam 1,14; Job 15,25; Matt 26,51; 1 Macc 12,29.42; 14,31; 2 Macc 15,32; Barn 12,2	Job 1,11-12; 2,5.
xviii. Destroy		2 Sam 24,16 (ἐξέτεινεν); Isa 14,26.27; Ezek 6,14; 14,9.13; 16,27; 25,7.13.16; 35,3; Dan 11,42; Zeph 1,4; 2,13
xix. Punish	Neh 13,21 (ἐκτενῶ)	
xx. To choose evil	Ps 125,3 (ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἐκτείνωσιν οἱ δίκαιοι ἐν ἀνόμῳ χεῖρας αὐτῶν)	

If one makes the *right* choice (Isa 56,4) one is not dried up. Jesus restores to the man his power of choice. By complying with Jesus' order he recognises that, his freedom being restored to him, he can make the right choice and save his own soul alive. What was his sin? Perhaps⁽⁴³⁾ embezzlement, since 'putting forth the hand' is the rabbinical term for fraud⁽⁴⁴⁾. Divine punishment operated by way of retribution⁽⁴⁵⁾. The man silently confesses and is forgiven, with a covert parallel with Mark 2,9 (ἔγειρε). The man's act is no less symbolic for being actual, and he knew it!

At the level of therapy this fits perfectly. Jesus' direction is no less a true miracle⁽⁴⁶⁾ for its exactly coinciding with a cure. The healer, so say modern experts⁽⁴⁷⁾, must (*i*) offer the patient the atten-

⁽⁴³⁾ Test. Sim. 2,13 attributes the paralysis to *wrath*.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Exod 22,8; *m. B.Meş* III. 12; *B. Qam.* 107b, *b. B.Meş* 43b, *Qidd.* 42b. As we see from the Mishnah cited here, "putting forth the hand" implies using the unowned property, and is quite distinct from theft and robbery on which see B. S. JACKSON, *Theft in Early Jewish Law* (Oxford 1972), a distinction of significance when it comes to the semantics of *yād* (*ibid.*, 92-93). To "stretch out the hand" implies taking possession.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Jub 4,31; Test. Gad. V. 11; Philo, *Flacc.* 170; Hillel at *m. 'Ab.* II. 6. Str-B I 444-446, II 193-197. G. F. MOORE, *Judaism* II (Cambridge, Mass. 1958) 248-249, 322; W. BOUSSET - H. GRESSMANN, *Die Religion des Judentums* (Tübingen 1966) 411-413.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ VAN DER LOOS was (needlessly) alarmed lest, by admitting that the conditions could be psycho-somatic, he should diminish the power of the healer and threaten the reality of the miracle.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ THORLEY and STERN, *Essentials*, 219; WILLIS, *Psychiatry*, 216; IMBODEN, *Practical Psychiatry*, 173.

tion he is unable to secure for himself, (ii) save the patient's face by offering him a way of escape which does not humiliate him further, and (iii) make it more valuable for him (e.g. by way of a histrionic gesture) to employ his limb than to continue to believe it paralysed. No act could be more symbolic in Jewry than to 'stretch out the arm', nor more ambiguous. I suspect the actual words were *p'sot y'dāk* (the equivalent of Heb. *š'lah yād'kā*), the action of (as we shall see) one under appointment by the deity. He responded (as such a patient might well do) by stretching out his arm, the effect on the *hand* being incidental! Did he stretch out both arms? In either case he was cured. Ἐκτείνων τὴν χεῖρα is therefore not simply, as usually supposed, a *wunderwirsames Wort*.

Many have noticed the story of Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 13. Though differing much from ours it is relevant. Loss of potency is shown by the arm being permanently extended (as nowadays under hypnotism)⁽⁴⁸⁾ — Jeroboam could not flex it. He stretched out his hand to do evil, and could not withdraw it. The prophet restored his power, so that he might extend it for good.

7. *Ritual and political implications* are obvious. The rationale of Sabbath taboos was called indirectly into question by one (a) whose teaching implied that true observance of the Sabbath obviated 'dry trees', and (b) required the choice of what would favour life, especially life in the World to Come, even if that meant that God worked cures (i.e. did not rest) on the Sabbath! It is conceivable that ancients thought of answering petitions as non-work, otherwise they would not pester their deity with prayer on his rest-day! Plotting the death of a person on the Sabbath, even for Sabbath-breaking (cf. Exod 31,14.15; 35,2; Num 15,32-36; Jub 2,25; *m. Sanh.* VII. 4), is called into question (which gravely hinders Sabbath-protection); and worse still one may have to honour the Sabbath by taking *any* step which earns the World to Come *for oneself or others*: which, needless to say, undermines all Sabbath taboos as such (Luke 6,5D).

⁽⁴⁸⁾ A natural hypnotist can cause people to feel paralysed (the case of Rasputin). On hypnosis and the paralysed arm see J. H. SCHULTZ, *Die seelische Krankenbehandlung (Psychotherapie)* (Stuttgart 81963) 106-107, 258-259, *Tafel III, Bild 6 (Katalepsie des Armes)*. Hypnosis is less used in therapy since it may be followed by other (conversion-) disorders. WILLIS, *Psychiatry*, 216.

Any prejudice which excludes the possibility of debate on principle counts as stubbornness of heart; of which each side might accuse the other, we note. But the miracle shows who has the better claim to attention.

The political implications are vast. 'Arise', and 'Stretch out the hand' could have a revolutionary sound in the ears of Herodians, whoever precisely these were⁽⁴⁹⁾. A hand divinely strengthened is preternaturally strong. It is equipped for much more than prayer! Is Jesus recruiting this riff-raff (cf. 5,19-20; 7,35-36), directly or indirectly, as YHWH recruited and equipped notabilities like Moses, Aaron, and Joshua (Exod 7,19; 8,5-6.16; 9,22; 10,12.21; 17,11-12; Josh 8,18-19)? If riff-raff are so equipped, what of others? If alarm was ever justified, it certainly is now⁽⁵⁰⁾.

History and the Pericope

Naturally we must proceed cautiously here. The rhetorical question could be apocryphal, also the slur on the opposition, as trap-setters. Yet things to come cast their shadows before. The cure itself speaks volumes. At least it makes it extremely probable that Deut 28-30 had actually become operative. Much flows from that, which is a red rag to a bull (cf. the Rejection at Nazareth). However the Markan picture of Jesus speaking in God's place and exercising his power of healing results, surely, from the knowledge of the Resurrected One.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ They represent "state" as the Pharisees represent "church". J. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York 1959) 279. A mystery was made of their identity: P. JOÜON, *RSR* 28 (1938) 585-588; H. H. ROWLEY, *JTS* 41 (1940) 14-27; S. SANDMEL, "Herodians", *IDB* II (1962) 594-595; H. W. HOEHNER, *Herod Antipas* (Cambridge 1972) 333 (well put); W. J. BENNETT, *NT* 17 (1975) 9-14 (relates to the Baptist: fanciful). GNILKA, *Markus*, 129, thinks of Agrippa I (A. D. 41-44)! Q. QUESNELL, *The Mind of Mark* (AnBib 38; Rome 1969) 132, doubts (unnecessarily) whether they considered killing Jesus. The idea they were Essenes is not accepted.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ WREDE, *Messiasgeheimnis*, 120-121, may have been wrong: there was a climax. J. JEREMIAS, *New Testament Theology* (London 1971) I 279 (warning had been given). The *communis opinio* is that Jesus outraged Jews by claiming that the acknowledged exceptions to Sabbath prohibitions were elastic at his option, whilst they pretended they were non-elastic (A. EDERSHEIM, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, [London - New York 1906] ii 59-60). I argue otherwise (above, pp. 176, 182). Note Jer 17,5 LXX!

The structure relies on the occasion being a Sabbath; this is no invention, all the more since the Sabbath foreshadows, and is the antechamber to, the World to Come⁽⁵¹⁾. Jesus did prefer to heal on the Sabbath. When the Torah was offered at Mt. Sinai, and accepted, it was patent that handicapped persons could neither appreciate nor observe it. Therefore all Israelites were miraculously made perfect: there were no cripples amongst them then⁽⁵²⁾. This much, admittedly, is familiar to Judaism; but Jesus' midrash is quite idiosyncratic. The conclusion, therefore, that, to honour the Law and the Sabbath properly, crippled persons must have a chance to be cured so that they have moral freedom to make the choice which YHWH set before them 'throughout their generations', is a conclusion which can hardly be other than historically authentic⁽⁵³⁾.

Mark and this Pericope

The amount of redactional composition is slight (vv.3.6). Yet the degree of harmony of the story with its Hexateuchal parallel is astounding. Patience is needed to see how the 'grid' operates, but the effort is rewarded. The theory that Mark compiled chapters 2-12 as a parallel to, and a contrast with, Exodus-Numbers-Joshua (taking Gen as read, neglecting Lev and Deut) is explained at *Bib* 63 (1982), pp. 499-504. The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus are the true outcome of the scheme entrusted, unhappily, to Moses and Joshua. Jesus improves on the performance of both of them. Such a notion can hardly be read back into Jesus' lifetime, yet the coincidences with the First Trek are as remarkable as they are frequent. The Torah, whilst not being false, is superseded by the Bridegroom appearing in person. What the Holy Spirit said *then* achieves fulfilment *now*, but numerous contrasts emphasise that *now* is not *then* (see Ezek 20,21-26!). Mark did not write a lectionary, for the parallels are not confined to clearly and exclusively devised sections, and

⁽⁵¹⁾ L. ROSENFELD, "The motif of freedom in the Sabbath", *Leo Jung Jubilee Volume* (New York 1962) 195-202 (references). FULLER, *Miracles*, 53, observed this. H. RIESENFELD, "Sabbat et jour du Seigneur", *New Testament Essays* (FS. T. W. Manson; Manchester 1959) 210-221 at 210-211.

⁽⁵²⁾ *Num. R.* VII. 1. GINZBERG, *Legends* III (1911) 78; VI 30 n. 176.

⁽⁵³⁾ R. H. STEIN, "The 'criteria' for authenticity", *Gospel Perspectives* (above, n. 37), I 225-263. See n. 6 above.

in his scheme many chapters of the model correspond to a few lines in the gospel; and whole books are omitted. But if Mark enables preachers to confute Jews out of their own scriptures this is not out of place. The New is the goal of the Old: an artificial contention propounded by a highly arbitrary method.

The study of the withered hand parallels Exod 13, relying on a few echoes from here and there in Exod 14-15. It is a fanciful parallel, but so is the whole scheme. The 'documentation' from Law, Prophets and Writings, which Mark inherited, did not suffice. Somehow the tale must run parallel with that of Moses. God through Jesus saves from the World as YHWH through Moses saved from Egypt. Whereas God destroyed the Egyptian firstborn while he saved Hebrew firstborn alive, Jesus only 'saves alive'. This far-fetched notion has echoes here and there in the gospel. That Exod 13 is indeed our chapter is clear from the following: Mark 2,23ff (march and grain on the Sabbath) fits Exod 12,31-40; Mark 3,7ff (the multitude at the seaside) fits Exod 13,18; 14,2; Mark 3,13ff (the Twelve as heralds) fits Exod 14,2.15 (cf. 16,12); Mark 3,20ff (Beelzebub and a divided house) recalls the treachery before Baal Zephon at Exod 14,2.9; and Mark 3,31ff (distractions from the 'near and dear') recalls Moses' silencing of dissidents and conflicting proposals at Exod 14,10-14 (MT, *Tgg.*). Thus to Exod 13 we must go.

In Exod 13 the strength of the divine arm produces the redemption from Egypt, which is to be commemorated annually as a continuing experience ('for me' Exod 13,8). The modest and fearful Moses stretched out his arm over the sea: in Mark 3,1-6 Jesus orders a paralysed man in a silent gathering to stretch out his hand and instantly the parties are polarised. YHWH brought Israel out of the *house of bondage* by the *strength of hand* (13,3.14.16). Though Moses stretched out his hand YHWH claimed that it was the stretching out of *his* hand which achieved the redemption: at least that is what Moses wrote (Exod 7,5). Jesus freed, on the spot, those who were *bound* like our paralysed man (Mark 7,35; Luke 8,29 [cf. Mark 5,3]; 13,16; John 11,44). Moses enabled the Israelites to march to Canaan; Jesus opens the way to the Kingdom of Heaven. The Redemption is a sign upon the *hand* (Exod 13,9.16). Not simply a question of those silly phylacteries, it is a connection of the individual's arm with the outstretched arm in Egypt. With a strong hand YHWH brought Israel out (13,9) and his agents shared his strength, which is entirely symbolic. We have an ordinance in its

appointed time (13,10) and the law shall be in their *mouths* (13,19). Hand, memorial, and law are in sequence. A halakhic debate may arise when strength is restored to an arm or hand on the Sabbath, itself a feast before the Lord (13,6). The paradigm is Exod 4,7!

The point of the Redemption, and of the observance of Pass-over is, according to Exod 13, the perpetuation of the race. The ritual is encapsulated in exhortations to sanctify the firstborn (Exod 13,2.12.13) and it is to one's son (Exod 12,24.26) one speaks of the strength of hand and the house of bondage (13,14). But stubbornness, hardness of heart (Exod 7,3; 13,15; 14,4.8.17; cf. 4,21) prevents perception of all miracles, and, as we have learnt, precludes posterity. Exod 9,34 has already explained that Pharaoh sinned in hardening his heart in spite of YHWH's hearing his prayer and the thunder's ceasing. Hardening the heart (Ps 94,8 LXX) interrupts the process of redemption fatally; and may well take from the Israelites even the Land itself (Isa 63,16-19, cf. Mark 12,9 par.).

Exod 13,17-18 rounds off our passage with a recondite allusion (see *Tg. Ps.-Jon.*) to dry bones which God will one day restore to life (Ezek 37,2.4.11). The Israelites on their Trek avoided the Vale of Dura where there were 200,000 corpses of the tribe of Ephraim who attacked the Philistines without orders, thinking they could work their own Exodus⁽⁵⁴⁾. Dry bones, other than the bones of Joseph, must not accompany the Trek, when God visits his people (Exod 13,19) even in the World to Come⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Here reference to the Sabbath is thin (cf. Deut 5,14-15); the part played by the Sabbath in our story is therefore not Mark's invention. Yet the insinuation that the Jews in Canaan were no better than Egypt under Pharaoh or the Children of Israel at Meriba is surely his. For both parties did indeed see YHWH's miracles but did not act upon them. Jesus' task was, in this view, to draw their attention to this, the miracle of the Hand proving to the 'stubborn-hearted' ones that Redemption was afoot. If persons like them had been in Egypt they would not have been redeemed, and if persons like them had been in the Wilderness they would have fallen there (Num 14,29). The hand was restored to enable the man to meet the

⁽⁵⁴⁾ 1 Chr 7,20-21 (*Tg.*). *Exod.R.* XX. 11 (Soncino 252-3). *Mek.* at Lauterbach i 172 n. 6.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ *Mek.*, *Bešallah* 1:166-167 (Lauterbach i 182).

requirements of the Holy Spirit as divulged, rather incompetently, in that chapter of Exodus. Or such is the idea.

Now if the synagogue is a house of bondage (Deut 28,68!) instead of a place where liberation is remembered, Jesus offers redemption from it rather than to it. As long as Moses held out his hands Amalek was destroyed (Exod 17,11-12); as long as Joshua held out his hand (Josh 8,18-19) the city of Ai was taken and destroyed. The strength came from God, who encourages the audiences of prophets to be strong of hand (Zech 8,9.13); whose omnipotence is the uplifted mighty arm and hand (Ps 89,13); who upholds the hand (Ps 37,24) and strengthens the arm (Ps 89,20-21), whereas he *breaks* the arm of the wicked (Ps 10,15; 37,17). Jesus too appoints men to forward his mission, and he too may order the stretching out of the hand. See what specimens he chooses for the purpose! So our 'hardness, or stubbornness of heart' (3,5) may well be derived from the Hexateuchal parallel, and owe its place to Mark's apologetics.

The theme of Jesus' opponents' watching him as at Ps 37,31-33; Isa 29,20-21; Jer 20,10-11; Dan 6,4 (cf. the pit syndrome: Ps 119,69.85-88; cf. Ps 7,15-16!) may be pre-Markan. Yet the idea that having (through God's mysterious decree: Isa 6,10; John 12,40) 'hardness of heart' they at once start plotting is very probably Markan, even though it too depends on a psalm, as we have noticed, (Ps 81,12) as well as the pair of psalms which couple 'watching' and 'consulting': Pss 71,10; 83,3.5 (cf. Ps 41,7, cf. 9), material available to all 'persecuted' groups. The Pharisees are of course shown by Mark as incorrigible⁽⁵⁶⁾. The phrase συμβούλιον ἐδίδουν puzzled even ancient readers (as we see from the galaxy of variant readings). In fact it is an attempt to render the idiomatic Aramaic expression *yahavû lâhem 'êšâ*, 'they took counsel together', the verb *yêhav* (Heb. *yâhav*) being capable of a great many renderings⁽⁵⁷⁾. The rhythm of syllables in v.6 (it runs 10:10:10:9) suggests a pre-Markan

⁽⁵⁶⁾ BETZ, *Plutarch's Ethical Writings* 26 (82A).

⁽⁵⁷⁾ For *yêhav* see M. JASTROW, *Dictionary of Talmud Babli...*, s.v. For *hâvû lâkem* Deut 1,3; Josh 18,4. For *hâvû 'êšâ* Judg 20,7; 2 Sam 16,20. A. HEIKEL, "Konjekturen", *TSK* 106 (1934/5) 314, is wrong. συμβουλία renders 'êšâ thrice in the LXX. δίδωμι renders *yêhav* / *hâvû* fifteen times, and the Aram. *yêhav* even more frequently.

passage resisting emendation. Συμβούλιον is rightly entered in our dictionaries as 'counsel', and we should not repine at that, whatever the meaning found in papyri. The connection between hardness of heart and plotting may be Markan chiefly because the theme of plotting (with its overtones of 'false witness') is integral to the Passion narrative, which casts its shadow over the whole tale.

It has been contended that the whole of Mark 2,1-3,6 has an eschatological orientation⁽⁵⁸⁾. Indeed the End of Days had come and Isa 56 was alive in fact. But the passage retains its critique of current Jewish exegesis of scripture; it assumes that charismatic power does indeed imply the right to establish an alternative system of social organization for which, anomalously, the old texts are made to serve as if they were the intellectual foundation.

Half Way House, High St.
Blockley, near Moreton-in-Marsh,
Gloucestershire GL56 9EX,
England

J. Duncan M. DERRETT

SOMMAIRE

Mc 3,1-6 peut être éclairé par les textes vétéroutestamentaires sur le Sabbat (par ex. Is 56,1-7) et sur le choix qu'implique l'alliance (Dt 30,15.19; Si 15,16-17). Le geste d'étendre la main a une portée symbolique bien documentée. Il peut être négatif, lorsqu'il signifie «se saisir» de quelque chose, entre autres pour voler ou accomplir une action défendue le jour du Sabbat. Il peut être positif, comme geste de prière ou geste qui suppose une puissance surnaturelle. Dans ce contexte, Jésus semble utiliser Dt 30,15.19 à la manière des midrashim. La synagogue n'a pas fait le bon choix; elle a provoqué la colère de Dieu; ainsi, se sont réalisées les malédictions de Dt 28. La «main desséchée» en est le signe et la preuve. Jésus propose à nouveau de choisir la vie (Dt 30,15.19) et il restaure le pouvoir de choisir de l'homme malade. Mais ce geste a pu déranger beaucoup de monde par ses implications religieuses et politiques.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ J. JEREMIAS, *Jesus als Weltvollender* (BFCT 33; Göttingen 1930) 21-32; H. RIESENFELD, *Jésus transfiguré* (ASNU 16; Copenhagen 1947) App. III 318-330; J. M. ROBINSON, *The Problem of History in Mark* (London 1957) 47; DUPREZ (n. 1 above).

¿Constituye Lc 3,21-38 un solo período? Propuesta de un cambio de puntuación

Desde muy antiguo el bautismo de Jesús (Lc 3,21-22) y su genealogía (3,23-38) han sido considerados como dos perícopas independientes, separándolas en consecuencia con un punto (seguido o aparte)⁽¹⁾. Los motivos que avalan esta división parecen obvios. La genealogía de Jesús se comporta a modo de inciso parentético introducido por Lucas entre el bautismo de Jesús en el Jordán (Lc 3,21-22 // Mc 1,9-11) y las tentaciones en el desierto (Lc 4,1-13 // Mc 1,12-13). Mi propuesta consiste en substituir el punto que separa ambas perícopas por una simple coma, pasando entonces los vv. 21-22 a constituir la prótasis de un único período, cuya apódosis estaría formada por los vv. 23-38. De hecho, no hay ninguna perícopa lucana que esté encabezada por la construcción Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὥσει ἐτῶν τριάκοντα (v. 23 a)⁽²⁾. Por otro lado, este encabezamiento singular se presenta repetidamente en el evangelio de Lucas en calidad de oración principal (apódosis), cuya acción se de-

(1) Desgraciadamente el P⁷⁵ tiene una laguna en este lugar. El P⁴ contiene ya la división tradicional, marcada por un punto alto al final del v. 22 y por la salida fuera de la caja de la escritura de la primera palabra del renglón siguiente subrayada encima por una raya horizontal (ἀρχόμενος). Los códices Vaticano y Alejandrino poseen igualmente una separación en dicho lugar. No así el código Sinaítico, en cuyo margen se ha introducido posteriormente la división por párrafos. Entre los editores, p.e., von Soden y Bover, así como Bover-O'Callaghan (*Trilingüe*) tienen un punto y seguido; Tischendorf, Merk, Aland-Black-Martini-Metzger-Wikgren y Nestle-Aland ponen un punto y aparte.

(2) Lucas tiene cierta preferencia en los encabezamientos de perícopa (en cursiva) o de inciso reasuntivo por el imperfecto perifrástico precedido de la partícula καί (sigla I) o seguido de la partícula δέ (sigla II): Lc 1,21 (I); 2,8 (I); 4,31b (I). 33 (I). 44 (I); 5,16 (II); 8,40b (γράφ); 11,14 (I); 13,10 (II); 15,1 (II); 19,47 (I); 21,37 (II); 24,53 (I); Hch 2,5 (II). 42 (II); 8,1a (II); 12,20 (II). Si en el pasaje en cuestión hubiese pretendido encabezar perícopa habría escrito sin duda καὶ ἦν Ἰησοῦς (como hace D) ἀρχόμενος. También se sirve frecuentemente del imperfecto: Lc 1,56 (II); 1,80b (I); 2,25 (καὶ ἰδοὺ). 36 (I). 40 (II). 41 (I). 52 (I); 3,7 (οὖν). 18 (μὲν οὖν); 4,15 (I), etc.

sarrolla a partir de o durante la determinación temporal indicada en la prótasis mediante la construcción ἐν τῷ + infinitivo⁽³⁾.

1. Construcciones lucanas

Este cambio de puntuación quizás nunca se me habría ocurrido si no me hubiese fijado en la doble lectura crítica de Act 19,1. En efecto, para dilucidar cuál de las dos lecturas tenía más probabilidades de ser la original, el llamado texto «occidental»⁽⁴⁾ o el texto comúnmente admitido por los editores⁽⁵⁾, pareció oportuno examinar las respectivas construcciones gramaticales, sobre todo la del texto ordinario, ya que — a primera vista — ésta se presentaba como una construcción típicamente lucana⁽⁶⁾. Se trataba de verificar si la cons-

⁽³⁾ Dicha expresión se presenta en Lucas con inusitada frecuencia: Lc 32 x (22 x en encabezamientos); Act 7 x (3 x id.); contra Mc 2 x y Mt 3 x; cf. J. C. HAWKINS, *Horae Synopticae* (Oxford 1968 [= 1909]) 40; H. GROBEL, *Formgeschichte und synoptische Quellenanalyse* (Göttingen 1937) 73.

⁽⁴⁾ Θέλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου κτλ. está atestiguado, según Nestle-Aland, por P^{38vid} D sy^{hmg} y, según METZGER (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [London-New York 1971] 468), además, «with partial support from it^{sig} and Ephraem».

⁽⁵⁾ Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπολλῶ κτλ. P^{74vid}SA(B)EΨ 33.945.1739. 1891pc (Mmin lat). Entre los comentaristas que señalan la doble lectura hay diversidad de pareceres sobre el valor de la variante occid. Así, p.e., Th. ZAHN, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* (Leipzig 1919) 672-673 y n. 89: “Die Vergleichung mit anderen Stellen, (...) zeigt nur die gleiche Unterordnung der Pläne des Pl unter Gottes Willen, Fügung oder Kundgebung (...), aber nicht die Spur einer verdächtigen Nachbildung in 19,1 A [= texto occid.]”. En cambio, METZGER, *Commentary*, 469, apostilla: «It is difficult to understand why so much is said about a purpose that was not accomplished. Weiss is correct in observing that “the whole antithesis between ἰδία βουλή and an order of the Spirit is neither in the character of Paul nor of Luke, who brings expressly into prominence how Paul allows all his decisions to be made by the will of God made known to him through the Spirit” [Der Codex D, p. 94, Anm. 1]».

⁽⁶⁾ La construcción Καὶ ἐγένετο (‘E. δέ [guarismos en cursiva]) seguida de la oración de relativo ἐν τῷ + inf. no aparece más en Act y sí, en cambio, con relativa frecuencia en Lc: 1,8; 2,6; 3,21; 5,1.12; 8,40 v.l. 42b v.l.; 9,18.29 v.l. 33.36 v.l. 51; 10,38 v.l.; 11,1.27; 14,1; 17,11.14 c; 18,35; 19,15; 24,4.15.30.51. Por otro lado, la construcción clásica del verbo γίνεσθαι seguido de un inf. *completivo* (É. DELEBECQUE, *Études grecques sur l’Évangile de Luc* [Paris 1976] 126) es bastante frecuente en Lucas, sobre todo en Act (en cursiva los pasajes en que se presenta bajo la fórmula ἐγένετο δέ): Lc 3,21-22; 6,1.6.12; 16,22; Act 4,5; 9,3 (orden inverso). 32.37.43; 10,25 (ὥς δὲ ἔ.);

trucción del texto ordinario: a) Ἐγένετο δέ, b) seguido de la determinación temporal ἐν τῷ + infinitivo y c) culminado por una oración de infinitivo con su consiguiente sujeto en acusativo (Παῦλον), se presentaba en otros pasajes lucanos⁽⁷⁾. El resultado de la colación se revelaba muy interesante: de las 19 (24 contando las variantes) veces en que se presenta la fórmula Ἐγένετο δέ (o Καὶ ἐ.) seguido de la proposición de relativo ἐν τῷ + infinitivo, esta original construcción lucana⁽⁸⁾ sólo iba seguida de un infinitivo completivo en la apódosis de dicho pasaje⁽⁹⁾ y en Lc 3,21-22; en las restantes ocasiones seguía siempre un verbo finito en tiempo imperfecto, simple⁽¹⁰⁾ o perifrástico⁽¹¹⁾, o en tiempo aoristo⁽¹²⁾, excepto en dos ocasiones en que no aparece verbo alguno⁽¹³⁾. Esta comprobación reclamó mi atención y me hizo advertir la existencia de ligeras incongruencias en la construcción de Lc 3,21-22, según veremos en seguida.

La presencia de temas típicamente lucanos en la recensión occidental de Act 19,1, perfectamente congruentes con la manera como — según Lucas — encauzó Pablo la misión tras la ruptura con Bernabé (15,36-40), en la que se aprecian frecuentes fricciones con la forma como la quería llevar a cabo el Espíritu Santo (cf. 16,6.7; 20,23; 21,4.11-12)⁽¹⁴⁾, inclinaba la balanza a favor de la variante de 19.1. Quedaba así en precario la construcción de Lc 3,21-22. Se

11,26b; 14,1; 16,16; 19,1; 21,1 (ὥς δὲ ἐ.). 5 (ὅτε δὲ ἐ.); 22,6.17; 27,44b (καὶ οὕτως ἐ.); 28,8.17.

(7) Sólo contabilizamos los pasajes en que se presenta la fórmula *trimembre*, y por cierto que en el *orden* indicado.

(8) F. BLASS — A. DEBRUNNER — F. REHKOPF, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen ¹⁴1976) [citado en adelante: B.-D.-R.], § 404, n. 1.

(9) Por cierto, la única ocurrencia de esta singular construcción en dicho libro (en Act 9,3 aparecen también los tres elementos, pero no encabezados por Ἐγένετο δέ); las 18 (23) restantes pertenecen al Evangelio.

(10) Lc 8,42b v.l.; 17,11; 18,35; 24,15.

(11) Lc 5,1; 14,1. Si nuestra conjetura se verifica, también 3,21-23.

(12) Lc 1,8-9; 2,6; 8,40 v.l.; 9,18.29 v.l. 33.36 v.l. 51; 10,38 v.l.; 11,1.27; 17,14c; 19,15; 24,4.30.51.

(13) Lc 5,12 (con verbo sobreentendido) y 9,29 (a no ser que se considere el v. 30 como la apódosis propiamente dicha [DELEBECQUE, *Études* 137]; en cuyo caso γίνεσθαι no modificaría la acción del part. pr. ἐξαστράπτων [B.-D.-R. § 354,1]).

(14) Desarrollado en «La darrera pujada de Pau a Jerusalem: 'Desviació' del camí cap a Roma», *RevCatTeol* 5 (1980) 1-94, y más extensamente en *Pablo y la misión entre los paganos* (en prensa).

imponía un análisis riguroso de esta solitaria construcción. A pesar de que, como se ha visto, sea perfectamente lucana y refleje una construcción clásica la presencia de un infinitivo completivo pendiente del impersonal ἐγένετο (Ἐγένετο δὲ... ἀνεωχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι), Lucas evita esta construcción cuando introduce una determinación temporal que distanciaría en demasía el impersonal ἐγένετο del infinitivo regido por ἐλ. En el caso presente la distancia sería todavía más notable, por cuanto la fórmula introductoria va seguida de una triple determinación temporal: 1) ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν, 2) καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος y 3) καὶ προσευχομένου. Por lo que atañe a la primera determinación temporal, Lucas la emplea bajo dos modalidades⁽¹⁵⁾: 1) con el infinitivo presente, señalando una acción (durativa) contemporánea a la acción principal⁽¹⁶⁾ o 2) con el infinitivo aoristo, designando una acción (complexiva) anterior, pero recién terminada⁽¹⁷⁾. En nuestro caso, el aoristo βαπτισθῆναι muy bien puede traducirse por la locución «después de un bautismo del pueblo en masa». Mediante un καὶ aditivo⁽¹⁸⁾ introduce Lucas dos nuevas determinaciones, sirviéndose esta vez de un doble genitivo absoluto referido a un único sujeto, Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου. El acoplamiento del primer genitivo absoluto con la primera determinación temporal no ofrece más dificultad que la de usar la partícula καί como cópula para unir una oración de infinitivo con un genitivo absoluto, ya que de otro lado ambas proposiciones se encuentran en aoristo: «después de un bautismo del pueblo en masa y una vez se hubo bautizado (también) Jesús», di-

⁽¹⁵⁾ B.-D.-R. § 404,1 y n. 4 hace notar el uso bien diferenciado por Lucas de ἐπανερχεσθαι (Lc 10,35c) / ἐπανελθεῖν (19,15), πορεύεσθαι (17,11) / ἐλθεῖν (14,1), λέγειν (11,27) / λαλῆσαι (11,37).

⁽¹⁶⁾ Lc 1,8.21b; 2,6.43b; 5,1.12; 8,5b.40.42b; 9,18.29.33.51; 10,35c.38; 11,1.27; 12,15c; 17,11.14c; 18,35; 24,4.15.51; Act 2,1; 3,26; 4,30; 8,6; 9,3; 19,1. Según DELEBECQUE, *Études*, 125, esta construcción estaría más en armonía «avec la préposition ἐν (τῷ) parce que celle-ci implique une certaine durée».

⁽¹⁷⁾ Lc 2,27b; 3,21; 9,34b.36; 11,37; 14,1; 19,15; 24,30; Act 11,15. Cf. M. ZERWICK, *Graecitas biblica* (Romae 1966) § 390; F. RIENECKER, *Sprachlicher Schlüssel zum Griechischen Neuen Testament* (Giessen-Basel 1963) 159: "die so eingeführte Handlung als eine im Augenblick des Eintritts der Haupthandlung vergangene, aber eben erst aufhörende".

⁽¹⁸⁾ B.-D.-R. § 423,3, n. 9.

ficultad que queda minimizada en la traducción castellana. En cambio, el segundo genitivo absoluto a la dificultad ya mencionada añade una nueva, por tratarse de un participio presente que inicia una duración: «cuando se puso a orar». No cabe duda que los tres infinitivos aoristos que siguen, ἀνερχθῆναι, καταβῆναι y γενέσθαι, marcan la incidencia de tres sucesos puntuales acaecidos durante la acción durativa de orar (καὶ προσευχομένου). ¿Qué papel desempeñan, entonces, las otras dos determinaciones de pasado? Señalarían el término después del cual ha tenido lugar la triple acción principal de «abrirse el cielo», «bajar sobre él el Espíritu Santo» y «oírse una voz del cielo». Así se ha entendido hasta ahora. La construcción, sin embargo, no deja de ser abigarrada.

Siempre que Lucas emplea ἐν τῷ + infinitivo como determinación temporal (excluidos los casos en que funciona como simple locución adverbial⁽¹⁹⁾ o como infinitivo substantivado⁽²⁰⁾), ésta hace referencia directa e inmediata a la acción de la proposición principal subsiguiente. Si la determinación temporal connota una duración (infinitivo presente), sigue o bien una acción puntual (aoristo) que incide en el proceso indicado⁽²¹⁾, o bien otra duración (imperfecto, simple o perifrástico, futuro) que se conmensura con aquél⁽²²⁾. Si connota, en cambio, una acción recién acabada (infinitivo aoristo), sigue o bien otro aoristo, generalmente dentro de la sucesión narrativa⁽²³⁾, o bien un tiempo durativo sucesivo al aoristo⁽²⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Lc 1,21; Act 3,26; 4,30 (cf. B.-D.-R. § 404,2 con n. 6).

⁽²⁰⁾ Lc 12,15 c (ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινί).

⁽²¹⁾ Lc 1,8-9; 2,6.43b; 8,5b.40; 9,18.29 v.l. 33.51; 10,38; 11,1.27; 17,14c; 24,4.51; Act 9,3 (ἐγένετο... ἐγγίζειν); 19,1 (ἐγένετο [κατ]ελθεῖν). A esta lista podría añadirse Lc 9,29 (ἐγένετο... λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων: cf. B.-D.-R. § 354,1, n. 1).

⁽²²⁾ Lc 5,1; 8,42b; 10,35c; 17,11; 18,35; 24,15.51. A esta lista podría añadirse Lc 5,12, por estar implícito el impf. ἦν en la apódosis.

⁽²³⁾ Lc 2,27b-28 («Apenas introdujeron el niño... también él lo tomó en sus brazos»); 9,34b («Apenas entraron en la nube se asustaron»); 9,36 («Cuando cesó la voz, Jesús estaba solo»); 19,15 («Apenas regresó... mandó llamar»); 24,30 («Una vez se hubo recostado... pronunció la bendición»); Act 11,15 («Apenas empecé yo a hablar, cayó el Espíritu Santo sobre ellos»). Cabría añadir el pr. histórico ἐρωτᾷ de Lc 11,37 («Apenas terminó de hablar, lo invitó»).

⁽²⁴⁾ Lc 14,1 («Apenas entró él..., también ellos [cf. 6,7 y 11,53-54] se pusieron a acecharlo»).

En el caso que estamos examinando, la primera determinación temporal, ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν, no precisa de forma inmediata el momento en que se abrió el cielo, etc. No se puede traducir, en efecto, por analogía con los casos construidos con el infinitivo aoristo⁽²⁵⁾, «Apenas se hubo bautizado el pueblo en masa... se abrió el cielo...», ya que el cielo no se abrió al término del bautismo del pueblo, sino después de que hubiesen intervenido otros dos factores decisivos, contenidos en el doble genitivo absoluto. Tampoco la segunda determinación, καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος, designa el momento preciso en que se abrió el cielo. Lucas tiene especial interés en recalcar que la acción principal, expresada — según la puntuación corriente — por otros tres infinitivos aoristos, tiene lugar durante la acción de «orar», iniciada por Jesús apenas se hubo bautizado (Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου): «una vez Jesús se hubo bautizado, cuando se puso a orar, se abrió el cielo, bajó sobre él el Espíritu Santo en forma visible de paloma y se oyó una voz del cielo». La secuencia constituida por una forma verbal puntual (βαπτισθέντος) y otra durativa (προσευχομένου) fija el momento preciso en que tuvo lugar la triple revelación.

2. La apódosis de Lc 3,21-22 se encuentra en el v. 23

Si se substituye el punto colocado al final del v. 22 por una coma, desaparece toda incongruencia. 1) La singular construcción de Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ + infinitivo, seguido de un infinitivo completo, única en el Evangelio y puesta en cuestión en Act 19,1, cede su lugar a la típica construcción de ἐγένετο, precedido de καὶ o seguido de δέ, formando una primera proposición principal, seguida de una determinación temporal (ἐν τῷ + infinitivo) y coronada con una segunda proposición principal (con el verbo en tiempo finito)⁽²⁶⁾. 2) Desaparece asimismo el singular encabezamiento del v. 23, único en su género en la doble obra lucana. 3) La primera determinación temporal (ἐν τῷ + infinitivo) abraza ahora los cuatro infinitivos aoristos

(25) En su forma actual, Lc 3,21-22 debería clasificarse entre los pasajes aducidos en la n. 23 por corresponder al inf. aor. ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι otro aor., ἐγένετο... ἀνεψυχθῆναι.

(26) Se trata de la fórmula llamada por DELEBECQUE (*Études*, 126) de tipo B.

perfectamente coordinados: ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι... καὶ ἀνεψυχθῆναι... καὶ καταβῆναι... καὶ... γενέσθαι. De este modo la peculiar determinación temporal recupera su función propia de señalar de forma inmediata el momento preciso en que tiene lugar la acción de la proposición principal. 4) La anomalía observada entre la primera determinación temporal y la segunda y tercera, contenidas éstas en el doble genitivo absoluto, se ha esfumado al dejar el primer καὶ de ser aditivo y pasar a funcionar como cópula entre la primera y la segunda proposición de infinitivo. El doble genitivo absoluto constituye así un inciso parentético muy necesario para que el lector se dé cuenta de que la secuencia de tres infinitivos que sigue no depende ni del bautismo masivo del pueblo ni tampoco — y aquí reside la novedad de la construcción lucana — del bautismo de Jesús, sino del momento en que Jesús, una vez se hubo bautizado, *se puso a orar*. 5) Aparece así un dato completamente nuevo: el comienzo del ministerio público de Jesús a la edad de treinta años se enmarca solemnemente en una séxtuple determinación temporal constituida por cuatro proposiciones subordinadas de infinitivo y por otras dos contenidas en el doble genitivo absoluto intercaladas después de la primera precisión temporal. 6) Finalmente, gracias a la nueva puntuación se soslaya una ligera anomalía no reseñada hasta ahora. En efecto, en la puntuación corriente, al regir Ἐγένετο los tres infinitivos completivos, se observa el uso redundante de Ἐγένετο... φωνῆν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι. La redundancia desaparece al pasar, el primero, a constituir una primera proposición principal y, el segundo, a ser regido por la construcción de relativo ἐν τῷ. Antes de examinar en detalle el período así obtenido, veámoslo en forma estructurada (entre paréntesis se numeran las seis determinaciones temporales):

Ἐγένετο δὲ

ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν (1),

καὶ — Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος (2) καὶ προσευχομένου (3) — ἀνεψυχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν (4),

καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... ἐπ' αὐτόν (5),

καὶ φωνῆν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι... (6),

καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὥσει ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὧν υἱός — ὡς ἐνομιζέτο — Ἰωσήφ τοῦ... τοῦ θεοῦ.

Al unir en un solo período las dos perícopas tradicionalmente consideradas como dos unidades independientes aparece con todo su vigor la peculiar construcción lucana construida a base a) del *pleo-*

nasmo Ἐγένετο δέ — usado también por los clásicos al principio de la narración⁽²⁷⁾ — carente de significación y sin ni tan sólo influir en la construcción⁽²⁸⁾ (Lc 3,21a); *b*) de la prótasis propiamente dicha, consistente en una determinación temporal considerada como un hebraísmo y que los LXX traducen precisamente por ἐν τῷ + infinitivo⁽²⁹⁾ (3,21b-22); *c*) de la apódosis consiguiente, construida a su vez — según opinión generalizada entre los autores — mediante un nuevo hebraísmo, (ἐγένετο. . .) καί + verbo finito⁽³⁰⁾, «correspondiente al *waw* que, después de una subordinada, temporal o condicional, anuncia en hebreo la apódosis»⁽³¹⁾, hebraísmo que incluiría un septuagintismo, (καί) αὐτός en función de pronombre personal⁽³²⁾ (3,23). No todos los autores, sin embargo, están de acuerdo en considerar el καί αὐτός/αὐτοί como un hebraísmo. Michaelis se inclina por un septuagintismo lucano⁽³³⁾. Por otro lado, es conocido el uso en los clásicos de καί αὐτός en el sentido adverbial de «también él» (lat.

(27) B.-D.-R. § 472,3, n. 7: “Anfangsstellung von ἐγένετο bei Fortführung der Erzählung ist auch klassisch (Kieckers, Stellung 74)”.

(28) B.-D.-R. § 442,4a, n. 11; 472,3, n. 7: “Infolge der Neigung, mit einem Verbum finitum zu beginnen, kann vor die Zeitbestimmung ein bedeutungsloses und nicht einmal immer die Konstruktion beeinflussendes ἐγένετο gesetzt werden”.

(29) B.-D.-R. § 404,1.

(30) M. JOHANNESSEN, “Das biblische καί ἐγένετο und seine Geschichte”, *Z. f. vergl. Sprachforschung* 53 (1925) 198-211; ZERWICK, *Graecitas*, 389 y n. 1; 456; B.-D.-R. § 442,4a: «Hebraisierend ist das καί mit Verbum finitum nach καί ἐγένετο bzw. ἐγένετο δέ». Según DELEBECQUE, *Études*, 131, sin embargo, ese καί no es raro en Homero, Herodoto y Tucídides.

(31) DELEBECQUE, *Études*, 130. A continuación se ve precisado a puntualizar: «Cependant, si Luc adopte cet hébraïsme du *waw* ouvrant l'apodose, sa décision est sans doute facilitée parce que le tour ne peut dérouter un lecteur habitué au bon grec. (...) Ces exemples classiques éclairent le sens du tour chez Luc. Le verbe ἐγένετο jouant, vu sa place et ses emplois, un rôle de transition, et pouvant être jugé comme l'équivalent de la conjonction 'or', le καί souligne l'entrée en scène de la principale. . .» (131).

(32) B.-D.-R. § 277,3: «Für die 3. Person entspricht αὐτός = betontem 'er' (klassisch οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος oder ὅς)».

(33) W. MICHAELIS, “Das unbetonte καί αὐτός bei Lukas”, *ST* 4 (1950) 86-93: “Genau genommen können jedoch alle diese Belege auch als Septuagintismen angesehen werden, die man Lukas selber wird zutrauen dürfen. So ergibt sich, dass Nach- bzw. Weiterbildung des LXX-Sprachgebrauchs (vgl. Johannessen S. 198) als eine Wurzel des lukanischen Sprachgebrauchs und zwar zunächst für das *betonte* καί αὐτός in Betracht kommen wird”.

ipse quoque)⁽³⁴⁾, uso fácilmente comprobable en determinados pasajes lucanos⁽³⁵⁾. Se plantea la cuestión de si este uso posiblemente original de καί⁽³⁶⁾ no se debería extender igualmente a aquellos pasajes lucanos en que καὶ αὐτός va precedido de una determinación temporal⁽³⁷⁾. En este supuesto, el καί que precede la proposición principal (καὶ αὐτός/αὐτοί) no sería un hebraísmo/septuagintismo, para anunciar la apódosis, sino un elemento referencial («también» anafórico) destinado a relacionar el pasaje así marcado con otra situación similar relatada en el propio Evangelio o en pasajes veterotestamentarios bien conocidos del lector. En el presente pasaje, la apódosis así introducida rezaría: «también él, Jesús, comenzaba (su ministerio mesiánico) a la edad de treinta años». Más adelante se darán las razones que apoyan esta elección.

3. Paralelismo entre el comienzo del ministerio precursor de Juan y el mesiánico de Jesús

El período así obtenido queda avalado con el paralelismo que espontáneamente se establece con el comienzo del ministerio del Bautista, continuación lógica de la presentación también paralela de

⁽³⁴⁾ F. M. ABEL, *Grammaire du grec biblique* (Paris 1927) 132: «Καὶ αὐτός paraît comme en classique avec le sens de *lui aussi, ipse quoque*»; R. KÜHNER – B. GERTH, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Hannover 1966) I 653, n. 1: «f) καὶ αὐτός, wie im Lat. *et ipse*, auch selbst = gleichfalls. ξ, 45; X. Hell. 3.1,10; An. 3.4,44; 5.5,9; 7.6,18»; E. SCHWYZER, *Griechische Grammatik II* (München 1950) 211: «zahlreiche, schon homerische, Sonderentwicklungen: 'sogar', 'von selbst'; 'gerade, eben'; καὶ αὐτός 'sogar selbst; gleichfalls'». También en los papiros, cf. E. MAYSER, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolomäerzeit* (Berlin-Leipzig 1970 [= 1926]) II,1 65: «a) καὶ αὐτός. Der Gebrauch ist sehr häufig und vom klassischen nicht verschieden».

⁽³⁵⁾ Cf., para καὶ αὐτός, Lc 19,9; καὶ αὐτή, Lc 1,36; καὶ αὐτοί, Lc 11,4; 14,12; 16,28; Act 15,32; 24,15; 27,36.

⁽³⁶⁾ A. T. ROBERTSON, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (New York 1914) 1180: «(Καὶ) The Adjunctive Use ('Also'). This is possibly the original use, though one cannot tell. It is thus like the Latin *et-iam*»; B.-D.-R. § 442: «Bei καὶ scheidet sich die kopulative Bedeutung 'und' von der (älteren) adverbialen 'auch'».

⁽³⁷⁾ Lc 2,27b-28; 3,21-23; 5,1; 9,51; 10,38 v.l.; 14,1; 17,11; 24,15; extensible a su vez probablemente a 8,1.22.

Juan Bautista y de Jesús en los dos primeros capítulos. En efecto, después de haber fijado Lucas, de forma solemne, el momento histórico en que Dios dirigió la palabra a Juan, hijo de Zacarías, en el desierto (3,1-2), donde residía desde su juventud (1,80), quiere contrastarlo ahora con otro momento, metahistórico o teológico, precisado también de forma solemnísimamente, en que Jesús, superior en todo a Juan (3,16), comienza «también él» — como otros personajes del AT — su ministerio «mesiánico» a la edad de treinta años «mientras oraba» en el Jordán. En vez de fijar este acontecimiento con una serie de datos históricos, humanamente verificables, como fue el caso del comienzo del ministerio «bautista» de Juan: «El año quince del gobierno de Tiberio César, siendo Poncio Pilato gobernador de Judea, Herodes tetrarca de Galilea, su hermano Filipo tetrarca de Iturea y de la región de Traconítida, y Lisanio tetrarca de Abilene, bajo el sumo sacerdote Anás y Caifás, llegó un mensaje de Dios a Juan, hijo de Zacarías, en el desierto» (3,1-2), lo enmarca con una acumulación de datos metahistóricos, de alcance *teológico*: «Sucedió que, después de que se bautizase el pueblo en masa y — después de bautizarse Jesús, mientras oraba — se abriese el cielo y bajase sobre él el Espíritu Santo en forma visible de paloma y se oyese una voz del cielo... también él, Jesús, comenzaba (su ministerio) a la edad de treinta años, siendo hijo — según se creía — de José, de... Dios» (3,21-23).

Según se podrá comprobar a continuación, Lucas tiene ante sí el texto en que Marcos nos presenta sucesivamente al precursor, Juan Bautista, y al personaje central del Evangelio, Jesús. En el caso de Juan, no se contenta con señalar el comienzo de su ministerio (Marcos reserva para más adelante el desenlace del mismo, Mc 6,14-29), sino que, después de fijar históricamente y de forma muy solemne el inicio, ofrece una visión complexiva de todo el ministerio del Bautista (Lc 3,18-20). Recuérdese que Lucas ha presentado ya los dos principales protagonistas en los dos primeros capítulos, subrayando, mediante el paralelismo de contraste, la primacía de Jesús respecto de Juan. Por lo que atañe al inicio de la actividad del Bautista, Lucas retiene casi todos los elementos del encabezamiento marcano, a excepción de las descripciones de la personalidad y hábitos del Bautista (Mc 1,2b.6: cf. Lc 1,76.80; 7,25.27), pero altera sensiblemente el orden de los incisos y les confiere una inflexión distinta, como se puede inferir de la siguiente colación:

Mc 1,2-8

Presentación de Juan Bautista

Lc 3,2-7.16

*Comienzo del ministerio
de Juan*

^{2a} Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑσαΐᾳ
τῷ προφῆτῃ·

^{2b} Ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω κτλ.

³ φωνή κτλ. hasta τρίβους αὐτοῦ,

^{4a} ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν
τῇ ἐρήμῳ

^{4b} καὶ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετα-
νοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

⁵ καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν
πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ
Ἱεροσολυμίται πάντες, καὶ
ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ
Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ἐξομολογού-
μενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

⁶ καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης κτλ.

^{7a} καὶ ἐκήρυσσε λέγων·

^{7b} Ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου
ὀπίσω μου,

^{7c} οὐδ' οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς κύψας λῦσαι
τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων
αὐτοῦ·

^{8a} ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι,

^{8b} αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύ-
ματι ἁγίῳ.

^{4a} ὥς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων
Ἑσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου·

(cf. 7,27)

^{4b} φωνή κτλ. hasta τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

^{2b} ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννην
τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν ἐν τῇ
ἐρήμῳ.

³ καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν περί-
χωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων
βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν
ἁμαρτιῶν.

⁷ Ἐλεγεν οὖν τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις
ὄχλοις βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ·
Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν κτλ.

^{16a} ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων πᾶσιν ὁ
Ἰωάννης·

^{16c} Ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου,

^{16d} οὐδ' οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν
ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ·

^{16b} ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς·

^{16e} αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύμα-
τι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί.

Donde más se notan los cambios introducidos por Lucas en el texto de Marcos es en el séxtuple sincronismo de la investidura de Juan, en contraste con el comienzo intemporal de la actividad del Bautista según Marcos (compárese Mc 1,4a con Lc 3,1-2)⁽³⁸⁾. En cambio, en el caso de Jesús Lucas se ciñe mucho más al texto de

(38) E. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Tübingen 1975) 50.

Marcos, respetando el orden de los incisos. Pero, al igual que en el caso de Juan, cambia notablemente la construcción de la frase principal, haciendo recaer el acento no — como Marcos — en el hecho puntual de venir (ἦλθεν) Jesús al Jordán y de bautizarse (καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη), sino en el hecho de que también Jesús comenzó su ministerio a la edad de treinta años. La escueta determinación temporal de Marcos (ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις) se torna solemnísimā — séxtuple precisión temporal — en Lucas (ἐν τῷ + 4 infinitivos y 2 genitivos absolutos):

Mc 1,9-11

Presentación de Jesús

⁹ Καὶ ἐγένετο
ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις
ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρετ τῆς
Γαλιλαίας
καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην
ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου.
¹⁰ καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίγων ἐκ τοῦ
ὔδατος
εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν κα-
ταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν.
¹¹ καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν
οὐρανῶν.
Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,
ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

Luc 3,21-23

*Comienzo del ministerio
de Jesús*

²¹ Ἐγένετο δὲ
ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν
λαόν,
καὶ — Ἰησοῦ
βαπτισθέντος
καὶ προσευχομένου —
ἀγεωχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν,
²² καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ
ἅγιον σωματικῶς εἶδει ὡς περι-
στερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν,
καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι.
Υἱός μου εἶ σύ,
ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε⁽³⁹⁾,
²³ καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμε-
νος ὥσει ἐτῶν τριάκοντα κτλ.

(³⁹) Variante antiquísima conservada por Diogneto, Evangelio de los Ebionitas, Justino [Clemente], Orígenes, Didascalia, Metodio, Juvenco [Ambrosiaster], Hilario, Constituciones Apostólicas, Faustino [Ticonio], Agustín, así como por el código Bezae y la mayoría de códigos de la versión itálica (a.b.c.d. ff².l.r¹). METZGER, *Commentary*, 136, la considera secundaria por el hecho de derivarse del Sal 2,7: “The Western reading, (...) which was widely current during the first three centuries, appears to be secondary, derived from

Gracias a la nueva puntuación aparece con toda claridad cuál es el *propósito* de Lucas al refundir la escena del bautismo. Mediante la fórmula estereotipada trimembre 1) Ἐγένετο δέ + 2) ἐν τῷ + infinitivo + 3) καὶ αὐτός + tiempo finito⁽⁴⁰⁾, Lucas hará continuas referencias en el Evangelio a hechos o situaciones del AT conocidas de sus oyentes, a fin de dar resalte a la actuación de Jesús en los momentos más relevantes⁽⁴¹⁾. Ciñéndonos al caso presente, el encabezamiento de la apódosis contenida en los vv. 23-38 tiene una clara función anafórica, «también él, Jesús, tenía al comenzar (su ministerio) como treinta años» (v. 23), aludiendo a determinado/s personaje/s del AT que comenzó/comenzaron su ministerio precisamente al llegar a esta edad. Rengstorf⁽⁴²⁾ lo relaciona con 2 Sam (2 Re LXX) 5,4, donde se dice que *David* tenía treinta años cuando fue ungido rey de todo Israel (υἱὸς τριάκοντα ἐτῶν Δαυὶδ ἐν τῷ βασιλεῦσαι αὐτόν): Jesús sería el nuevo David (cf. Lc 1,30-33; 2,11.21-22)⁽⁴³⁾. Ernst hace no-

Ps 2.7". Ahora bien, con mayor motivo debería considerarse *secundario* el texto ordinario por derivarse del pasaje paralelo [p] de Mc 1,11. La variante occid. es *lectio difficilior*. La razón de su sistemática eliminación por los grandes unciales (a excepción de D) y por los minúsculos debería buscarse en la controversia arriana, que culminó en el Concilio de Nicea, a fin de evitar connotaciones adopcionistas.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Fórmula *triple*: Lc 3,21-23; 5,1; 9,51; 10,38 v.l.; (14,1: καὶ αὐτοί); 17,11; 24,15. Fórmula *doble*: Lc 5,17; 8,1.22.

⁽⁴¹⁾ B.-D.-R. § 442,4 (véase nuestra n. 30) considera la construcción καὶ ἐγένετο o ἐγένετο δέ seguida de καὶ + verbo finito como un hebraísmo (abundante bibliografía en su n. 11). Además de Act 5,7, aduce en nota Mt 9,10; Lc 5,1.12.17; 8,1.22; 9,28.51; 10,38 v.l.; 14,1; 17,11; 18,35 (?); 19,15 y 24,15. Añádase 24,4. A excepción de las construcciones con καὶ ἰδοὺ (Mt 9,10; Lc 5,12; 9,29-30 [*sic*: cf. nuestra n. 21] y 24,4) y de Lc 19,15 (καὶ εἶπεν), hebraísmos muy probables, en todos los pasajes en que se presenta la construcción καὶ αὐτός (siempre referida a Jesús, excepto el plural de 14,1) la partícula καὶ no tiene, a nuestro modo de ver, función copulativa, sino que conserva su antigua función *adverbial* («también»), según se ha apuntado más arriba (véanse nuestras nn. 34.36).

⁽⁴²⁾ K. H. RENGSTORF, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Göttingen 1978) 60.

⁽⁴³⁾ *Lukas*, 25: "Vor allem die Anspielung auf 2. Sam. 7,12ff. ist aufschlussreich; denn 2. Sam 7,12ff. (vgl. Ps. 89,27f.; Ps. 2,7) enthält jene Hausprophetie der davidischen Dynastie aus dem Munde Nathans, die als die Verheissung eines zweiten und endgültigen David für das Selbstbewusstsein des Davidshauses ebenso grundlegend geworden ist wie für die gedankliche Durchbildung des Messianismus auf israelitisch-jüdischem Boden".

tar que «los 30 años constituyen el término prescrito por la Ley para asumir el ministerio sacerdotal. Entre los personajes importantes de Israel, José desde Egipto (Gen 41,46), el rey David (2 Sam 5,4) y el profeta Ezequiel (Ez 1,1) fueron llamados por Dios precisamente a esta edad»⁽⁴⁴⁾. Ya Orígenes lo relacionó con José⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Aquí es la primera vez en que Lucas utiliza esta fórmula solemne⁽⁴⁶⁾. La mención de *Jesús* («también él, Jesús...») no sólo era necesaria por la lejanía de la primera mención en el v. 21, sino porque esta primera mención era oblicua (dentro de un genitivo absoluto), mientras que aquí es directa (dentro de la frase principal). Hay una mención análoga en 24,15 (primera mención de Jesús en la escena de Emaús). El imperfecto perifrástico ἦν... ἀρχόμενος⁽⁴⁷⁾, en lugar del simple imperfecto, usado con frecuencia por Lucas, confiere una cierta solemnidad a este comienzo («tenía al comenzar»). La forma como introduce Lucas los 30 años, ὥσει ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, no indica aproximadamente⁽⁴⁸⁾ ni, como en los papiros, la cifra exacta de años⁽⁴⁹⁾. Teniendo en cuenta la predilección de Lucas por las cifras / analogías precedidas de ὡς/ὥσει, su papel significativo debe estar de acuerdo con su significado elemental, función de comparativo, destinado a relacionar la cifra o analogía así marcada con otra

⁽⁴⁴⁾ J. ERNST, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Regensburg 1977) 155. Cf. también I. H. MARSHALL, *Commentary on Luke* (Grand Rapids 1978) 162.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ *HLC XXVIII* (GCS IX 163-165).

⁽⁴⁶⁾ En Lc 2,27b-28 parece retener también esta función *adverbial*, referida esta vez a Simeón: «Apenas introdujeron sus padres el niño Jesús, también él (καὶ αὐτός = Simeón) lo tomó en sus brazos». “First the parents, and then *he* holds the child in his arms; the καὶ being either ‘also’ (he as well as they), or simply introducing the apodosis after ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν” (A. PLUMMER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke* [Edinburgh 1977] 67). La fórmula, sin embargo, no es solemne (falta el ἐγένετο δέ inicial). ¿Hay, además, una referencia implícita a situaciones parecidas como el encuentro de Israel (Jacob) con su hijo José (Gen 46,29-30) o de Ana con su hijo Tobías (Tob 11,9 LXX)? Tratándose de un bebé, Lucas habría sustituido el «se le echó al cuello» por «lo tomó en sus brazos».

⁽⁴⁷⁾ M. ZERWICK – M. GROSVENOR, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament* (Rome 1981) 184: «(ptc) periph. was beginning (sc. his ministry) [Graecitas] § 360f.». Contra: KLOSTERMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 56.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Str.-B. II 155; W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin 1978) 110; RENGSTORF, *Lukas*, 60; ERNST, *Lukas*, 154; MARSHALL, *Luke*, 162.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ MAYSER II, 2: 135,1-5; 3: 168,26-32.

bien conocida que hace las veces de analogado principal. Parafraseando tendríamos que «también Jesús — como otrora el rey David — tenía al comenzar su reinado como Mesías la edad requerida de treinta años».

A diferencia de Juan, a cuyo propósito se repite — innecesariamente, según opinión generalizada⁽⁵⁰⁾ — que era «el hijo (τὸν υἱόν) de Zacarías» (v. 2c), Lucas tiene sumo cuidado en precisar de Jesús que «era hijo (ὢν υἱός) — según se creía — de José...» (v. 23b). La misma diferencia ha sido ya sutilmente insinuada en el inciso anterior: a propósito de Juan se decía que «llegó un mensaje de Dios (ἔγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ) a Juan, el hijo de Zacarías, en el desierto» (v. 2), mientras que de Jesús ha dejado dicho que «se oyó una voz del cielo (φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι): Hijo mío eres tú, yo hoy te he engendrado» (v. 22b). En la investidura de Juan como profeta precursor del Mesías Lucas usa la típica fórmula de elección profética (Os 1,1; Miq 1,1; Jl 1,1; Jon 1,1; Sof 1,1; Ag 1,1.3; Zac 1,1; Is 2,1; Jer 1,2.4.11; Ez 1,3)⁽⁵¹⁾. En la investidura de Jesús prefiere la expresión del Sal 2,7, por considerar que ésta refleja mejor que la de Mc 1,11 el momento solemne de la intronización del Mesías, Hijo de Dios. Mediante el perfecto γεγέννηκα y la precisión temporal σήμερον, tan propia de Lucas (cf. Lc 2,11; 4,21; 5,26; 19,5.9; 22,43), cita del Sal 2,7 que aparece también en Hechos puesta en boca de Pablo (Act 13,33)⁽⁵²⁾, se subraya el momento escatológico en que Dios ha dado por acabada la generación de su Hijo como Mesías (cf. Lc 4,41), iniciada en el seno de María (1,31-33.35). Con la apostilla, «el hijo de Zacarías», proyecta Lucas sobre Juan la tradición paterna que lo entronca con el pasado religioso de Israel; Jesús, en cambio, no tiene pasado, por mucho que la gente creyera que era «hijo de José» (cf. 4,22b).

Al séxtuple sincronismo observado a propósito de la investidura de Juan corresponde una séxtuple determinación de alcance teológico

⁽⁵⁰⁾ B.-D.-R. § 162,1; ERNST, *Lukas*, 139; MARSHALL, *Luke*, 135.

⁽⁵¹⁾ PLUMMER, *Luke*, 85; MARSHALL, *Luke*, 134.

⁽⁵²⁾ Según esto, Pablo reservaría para el momento de la resurrección la entronización de Jesús como Mesías, en la línea de Rom 1,4. También Pedro, en el discurso pronunciado ante el pueblo en el Pórtico de Salomón, parece reservar la venida del Mesías predestinado a Israel al momento de la restauración universal que se inaugura con la resurrección (Act 3,18-26). Cf. así mismo Heb 1,5; 5,5.

destinada a enmarcar el comienzo del ministerio mesiánico de Jesús:

<i>Comienzo del ministerio precursor de Juan</i>	<i>Comienzo del ministerio mesiánico de Jesús</i>
«El año quince (Ἐν ἔτει δὲ πεν- τεκαίδεκάτῳ)	«Sucedió que, después de que (Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ)
(1) del gobierno (τῆς ἡγεμονίας) de Tiberio César,	(1) se bautizase (βαπτισθῆναι) el pueblo en masa,
(2) siendo gobernador (ἡγεμο- νεύοντος) Poncio Pilato,	(2) y — una vez Jesús se hubo bautizado (βαπτισθέντος),
(3) tetrarca (τετρααρχούντος) de Galilea Herodes,	(3) cuando se puso a orar (προσ- ευχομένου) —
(4) su hermano Filipo tetrarca (τετρααρχούντος) de Iturea y de la región de Traconítida,	(4) se abriese (ἀνεωχθῆναι) el cielo,
(5) y Lisanio tetrarca (τετρααρ- χούντος) de Abilene,	(5) bajase (καταβῆναι) el Espíritu Santo sobre él en forma visible de paloma,
(6) bajo el sumo sacerdote (ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως) Anás y Caifás,	(6) y se oyese (γενέσθαι) una voz del cielo: Hijo mío eres tú, yo hoy te he engendrado,
<i>llegó un mensaje de Dios (ἐγένε- το ῥῆμα θεοῦ) a JUAN, el hijo de Zacarías (τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱόν), en el desierto.»</i>	también él, JESÚS, comenzaba (ἦν... ἀρχόμενος) a la edad de treinta años (ὥσεί ἐτῶν τριάκοντα), siendo hijo — se- gún se creía — de José (ὡν υἱός — ὡς ἐνομίζετο — τοῦ Ἰωσήφ). . .»

El paralelismo sigue siendo de contraste. Observemos, además de los paralelos ya identificados, que «El año quince», en que comienza Juan su misión precursora, representa la mitad de «los treinta años», en que comienza Jesús su ministerio. Las dos primeras determinaciones temporales (1.2) se corresponden en ambas columnas mediante la repetición de un mismo tema, de mayor amplitud a menor, «gobierno-gobernador» // «se bautizase el pueblo – Jesús se hubo bautizado». Las tres siguientes determinaciones de la columna de Juan (3.4.5) están íntimamente relacionadas por la repetición de un mismo tema, «tetrarca»; igualmente, en la columna de Jesús, se describe a base de tres momentos (4.5.6) la revelación de Dios hecha

a Jesús «cuando se puso a orar» (3). Finalmente, la determinación relativa al poder religioso, «bajo el sumo sacerdote» (6), tiene su correspondencia en el poder de la oración, «cuando se puso a orar» (3). En la columna de la izquierda privan las diversas modalidades de poder (absoluto, subordinado, compartido; religioso; paterno); en la de la derecha, por el contrario, se insiste en la renuncia al poder (bautismo), en la disponibilidad y apertura tanto de Jesús como del cielo (Dios), en el ejercicio aparente del poder paterno (tradición) de José sobre Jesús y en la plena manifestación de Jesús como Hijo de Dios.

Si en lugar de limitarnos a comparar los respectivos encabezamientos, continuáramos la comparación en todo lo relativo a la labor programática de Juan y de Jesús, dispuesta una y otra por Lucas formando un ciclo completo⁽⁵³⁾, observaríamos nuevas correspondencias, algunas de ellas en forma de quiasmo. Así, la localización, «en el desierto» (3,2b), reaparece literalmente en las tentaciones de Jesús «en el desierto» (4,1); en cambio, el término técnico, «el pueblo» (3,21), se presentará por duplicado más adelante en el ciclo de Juan (3,15.18). Igualmente, la mención de las dos regiones de Palestina, «Judea» y «Galilea» (3,1b.c), reaparecerá en orden inverso en el ciclo de Jesús al principio de su labor (4,14) y en el sorprendente colofón final (4,44)⁽⁵⁴⁾. Un examen detenido de ambos ciclos pondría al descubierto una serie de correspondencias tendentes, como siempre, a contrastar ambos personajes.

4. Jesús inaugura el último período de la historia

A diferencia de Mateo (Mt 1,1: Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ), Lucas no pretende componer una

⁽⁵³⁾ A diferencia de Marcos, Lucas abre aquí y cierra el *ciclo de Juan* (3,1-20); así mismo, la *primera sección* relativa al *ciclo de Jesús* (3,21-4,44) contiene, de forma proléptica, la labor programática de Jesús con su desenlace.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ La mención de «Judea» ha llevado de cabeza a los copistas (ADΘΨ f¹³Mmin latt sy^{p,hms} bo^p leen Γαλιλαίας; W [1424] τῶν Ἰουδαίων) y sigue embarazando a los críticos y comentaristas (cf. METZGER, *Commentary*, 137-138; PLUMMER, *Luke*, 141; ERNST, *Lukas*, 183-184; MARSHALL, *Luke*, 198-199).

«genealogía» de Jesús, sino todo lo contrario, demostrar a partir de la «ascendencia» de José⁽⁵⁵⁾ que con Jesús empieza el último y definitivo período de la historia universal. Valiéndose, en efecto, de una sucesión de «once» septenarios (3 desde José hasta Salatiel [21º], final del exilio a Babilonia; otros 3 hasta David [42º]; 2 hasta Abrahán [56º] y otros 3 hasta Dios [77º]) señala Lucas que Jesús inaugura el «duodécimo» período de la historia del mundo, la última «semana» o era mesiánica⁽⁵⁶⁾. La ascendencia humana de José debería acabar en Adán, pero Lucas ve en Dios el origen y verdadero padre de la humanidad. Todas las dificultades surgidas del cotejo de la lista de Lucas con la genealogía de Mateo proceden de un planteamiento equivocado. Si se considera la lista de Lucas como una «genealogía», además de las evidentes discrepancias con la genealogía de Mateo, nos veríamos obligados a invertir los nombres y nos encontraríamos con un total de 78 personajes. Es más, todos los nombres que vienen después de José quedan excluidos automáticamente de la verdadera ascendencia de Jesús, proclamada en el v. 22c, merced al inciso parentético introducido por Lucas después del supuesto padre de Jesús (ὡς ἐνομίζετο). A la ascendencia humana que entronca a José con Dios como origen de la humanidad con-

(⁵⁵) Generalmente los comentaristas leen la lista en orden *inverso* al propuesto por Lucas y la hacen empezar «obviamente» en Adán. Así, METZGER, *Commentary*, 136, n. 1: «Thus, from Adam to Abraham, 3 × 7 generations; from Isaac to David, 2 × 7 generations; from Nathan to Salathiel (pre-exilic), 3 × 7 generations; from Zerubbabel (post-exilic) to Jesus, 3 × 7 generations, making a total of 11 × 7, or 77 generations from Adam to Jesus»; lo mismo hace MARSHALL, *Luke*, 160; «There are 77 names in the list from Jesus to Adam. These fall into 11 groups of 7, namely (in reverse order): Adam-Enoch; Methuselah-Shelah; Eber-Abraham; Isaac-Admin; Aminadab-David; Nathan-Joseph; Judah-Joshua; Er-Salathiel; Zerubbabel-Mattathias; Maat-Joseph; Jannai-Jesus. When the names are grouped in this way, it will be observed that the significant names fall at the beginning or end of the groups». En esta misma línea, no debe sorprender el último intento hecho por E. LERLE, «Die Ahnenverzeichnisse Jesu. Versuch einer Christologischen Interpretation», *ZNW* 72 (1981) 112-117, quien sugiere traducir Lc 3,23-38 como sigue: «Und er, Jesus, war etwa dreissig Jahre alt zu Beginn (seines Wirkens) als vermeintlicher Sohn Josephs, als Sohn (=Enkel) Elis, ... als Sohn (=Nachkomme) Davids, ... als Sohn (=Nachkomme) Adams, als Sohn Gottes».

(⁵⁶) Véase 4 Esd 14,11-12 lat; Str.-B. IV :2, 986-987; RENGSTORF, *Lukas-evangelium*, 61; MARSHALL, *Luke*, 160-161.

trapone Lucas la ascendencia directa que hace derivar a Jesús de Dios como Padre. En Jesús da comienzo algo completamente nuevo, la nueva historia de la humanidad.

5. Conclusión

La nueva puntuación propuesta no sólo da fluidez al texto, eliminando la difícil construcción del v. 21 (un καί copulativo uniendo una oración de infinitivo con un genitivo absoluto y la presencia de un durativo, προσευχομένου, determinando la triple revelación que sigue) y pone de relieve el momento solemne en que Jesús comenzó su actividad mesiánica, sino que corrige la pretendida ascendencia a partir de José (ὢν υἱός – ὡς ἐνομίζετο – Ἰωσήφ...) con la frase pronunciada por la voz del cielo (el Padre) que acaba de manifestar que Jesús no es un simple hombre sino que es el Mesías, el Rey realmente ungido por Dios, a quien «hoy» él personalmente «ha acabado de engendrar». La manifestación del Mesías, «Hijo de Dios», se ha producido en el momento en que Jesús, «después de haberse bautizado» (aceptando libremente la muerte simbolizada por el bautismo, como parte integrante del plan de Dios), «se puso a orar», restableciendo así el diálogo entre cielo y tierra. La mal llamada «genealogía» de Jesús deja de ser un mero intercalado⁽⁵⁷⁾, para quedar involucrada en la escena del Jordán, tal como insinúa la frase de Lc 4,1: «Jesús, lleno de Espíritu Santo, volvió *del Jordán*...». La investidura de Jesús como Mesías ha tenido lugar, como la de David, a la edad adulta de treinta años, dando comienzo a partir de ahora el duodécimo período o «semana» de la historia universal.

La incongruencia observada entre las dos primeras determinaciones temporales (bautismo masivo del pueblo y de Jesús) y la tercera (plegaria de Jesús iniciada después del bautismo) desaparece con la nueva puntuación. La séxtuple determinación temporal confiere gran solemnidad a la prótasis: a) el bautismo masivo de todo Israel (τὸν λαόν tiene sentido teológico)⁽⁵⁸⁾; b) dos precisiones complemen-

⁽⁵⁷⁾ ERNST, *Lukas*, 154: «In dem eingeschobenen Stammbau»; GRUNDMANN, *Lukas*, 110: «Durch die Einfügung des Stammbaumes».

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Más adelante precisará Lucas que los dirigentes de Israel — los fariseos y letrados — frustraron el designio divino al rehusar el bautismo de

tarias: 1) el bautismo de Jesús y 2) el hecho de ponerse a orar, determinante ésta última de c) la acción de abrirse el cielo, para no cerrarse ya nunca más⁽⁵⁹⁾, d) la acción de bajar el Espíritu Santo sobre Jesús y e) la acción de dejarse sentir una voz del cielo que explica con palabras el sentido de la unción de Jesús como Mesías. Entre el primer infinitivo aoristo (βαπτισθῆναι) y los otros tres consecutivos (ἀνερχθῆναι, καταβῆναι y γενέσθαι) inserta Lucas, en forma de paréntesis (marcado por un doble genitivo absoluto), la doble precisión complementaria que tiene como función determinar el momento exacto en que se produjeron las tres acciones subsiguientes y el doble móvil que las desencadenó: 1) una vez se hubo bautizado Jesús (Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος, acción realizada: el bautismo de Jesús es condición indispensable para lo que sigue) y 2) durante la acción de orar (καὶ προσευχομένου, duración subsiguiente: la oración de Jesús da razón del cambio de actitud del cielo). Dicho en otras palabras: el cielo se abrió, el Espíritu Santo bajó sobre Jesús y la voz del Padre se dejó sentir cuando aquél se puso a orar, apenas se hubo bautizado, es decir, después de haber aceptado el compromiso de morir si era preciso para llevar a cabo el plan que Dios le había propuesto. Esta séxtuple determinación temporal tiene como única finalidad enmarcar solemnemente el comienzo de una nueva era, del reinado de Jesús como Mesías. Finalmente, al juntar ambos períodos hasta ahora considerados como independientes, el segundo deja de ser un período truncado para recuperar su primitiva función, servir de apódosis del período precedente.

La distancia considerable que media entre la prótasis y la apódosis se explica en razón de la solemnidad del momento, por analogía con el comienzo de la actividad del Bautista. Las numerosas correspondencias observadas entre uno y otro encabezamiento sirven para contrastar el comienzo de la misión del precursor con el de la actividad del Mesías.

Facultat de Teologia de Barcelona
Diputació, 231
Barcelona-7 (España)

Josep RIUS-CAMPS

Juan, mientras que el pueblo entero e incluso los recaudadores dieron la razón a Dios aceptando el bautismo (7,29-30).

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Cf. Act 7,55-56.

SUMMARY

The baptism of Jesus and his genealogy have traditionally been considered as two independent pericopes. The present article suggests that they be regarded as a single unit. The first part is formed by what is currently looked upon as the "baptism of Jesus" (Luke 3,21-22); the second part is constituted by what is usually and unhappily designated as the "genealogy of Jesus" (3,23-38). The suggested interpretation changes the punctuation so that there is a comma instead of a full stop between verses 22 and 23 in order to avoid a series of inconsistencies which can be noted in the text as it stands. Thus the parallelism between John and Jesus is highlighted through the contrast between the beginning of the ministry of the Precursor and that of the Messiah. Jesus, like David, begins his (royal) messianic activity at the age of thirty, inaugurating the last and definitive ("the twelfth seven-year period") of the history of the world.

Confrontations in John 18,1-27

All four Gospels are narratives, that is, they are basically stories⁽¹⁾. Stories always deal with persons, what they do and / or say, how they interact, where, when, etc. One cannot tell a story without at least personifying the chief actors. Their interaction determines the plot-line of the narrative and the meaning of the whole story. As a story moves to its climax, the author's presentation of its chief characters may be expected to prove critically important for the audience's perception of its relevance to themselves. Accordingly, one may expect a given Evangelist to disclose his theology in terms of his chosen medium, the story, particularly as he brings the narrative to its climax and more closely interrelates the actions of the chief character, Jesus, both with those of his disciples and with those of his adversaries⁽²⁾. Needless to say, the passion-resurrection narrative

⁽¹⁾ The fact that the term "story" covers epics and dramas as well does not diminish its importance in the study of narrative. Nor should the further problem concerning "Gospel genre" distract one from the need to affirm that "story-form" is an issue central to literary criticism of the narrative-style Gospels. "Gospel" covers literary genres / forms other than narratives and so "Gospel genre" must be regarded as an analogous concept. For it can hardly exclude Paul's preaching, especially his speech in Rom 1,16-8,39, which is definitely not a narrative, but an argumentative exposition based on the attested fact of Jesus' death for us on the cross and his transforming bodily resurrection from the dead. That attested fact is what determines "the Gospel" — whatever literary forms the latter assumes. Even among the Four Gospels, its literary form (not to mention its literary structure) is analogous. Mark presents only its "beginning", and that as a kind of apocalyptic manifesto. Luke recasts it as a kind of religious history. John seems to present it as the attested eschatological theophany, the final and definitive manifestation of God as the Father and his Son Jesus Christ, who communicate the Spirit and provide everlasting life to believers.

⁽²⁾ For treatment of this topic in Mark, cf. R. C. TANNEHILL, "The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role", *JR* 57 (1977) 386-405. Similar approaches should be worked out for the other three Gospels. In my opinion, Tannehill has put his finger on the major axis of any Christian,

functions as the lodestone of every one of the story-form Gospels; the passion in particular stands out as the climactic "conflict" or "confrontation" in the plot-line of the Gospels.

Consequently, a reading of the Fourth Evangelist's passion narrative (John 18,1-19,42) from the way he tells the story, rather than, let us say, from an analysis of his sources or of the formal structure of his narrative or of its historical probability⁽³⁾, may come as a refreshingly simple and rewarding experience, providing solid insights into John's understanding of how Jesus' "personal revelation"⁽⁴⁾ works out. The compass of this paper requires that only a portion of John's passion-story be explored. Moreover, prudence dictates that one begin at the beginning. If only on these scores, then, this essay in theological exegesis should be limited to John 18,1-27.

Further reasons for so delimiting the study while at the same time including two distinguishable components (18,1-11 and 18,12-27) find their grounds in the movement of the narrative. Careful attention to entrances and exits distinguishes the staging of the Jo-

evangelical (i.e., gospel-form) communication, namely, the relation of Jesus to his disciples as realized through the passion-resurrection.

The interrelationships of Jesus, his disciples, and adversaries of both becomes quite marked from John 11 onwards. Before that (except perhaps for John 6) it is much less pronounced than it is in the Synoptics' account of the public ministry (e.g., Mark 2,13-28 pars.).

⁽³⁾ For a judicious review of recent monographs on the topic, cf. D. MOODY SMITH, "John and the Synoptics", *Bib* 63 (1982) 102-113. The question of sources seems disproportionately to dominate discussion of the Fourth Gospel. Study of the formal structure of the text may result in a narrow, static view of the composition, at the expense of other lines of interpretation, e.g., as in A. JANSSENS DE VAREBEKE, "La structure des scènes du récit de la passion en Joh. XVIII-XIX", *ETL* 38 (1962) 504-522. A historically-oriented approach is even less rewarding, as in J. SCHNEIDER, "Zur Komposition von Jo 18,12-17: Kaiphas und Hannas", *ZNW* 48 (1957) 111-119.

In looking for the *causes* of the text, as the scientific aspect of the exegete's task requires (the rest is art!), attention must be paid not only to the matter used by the author, or to its form, but also to the movement of the passage and, above all, to the end or *purpose* of the communication, the *causa causarum*. The rationale for this approach is unabashedly Aristotelian.

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. I. DE LA POTTERIE, *La Vérité dans Saint Jean* (AnBib 73-74; Rome 1977) II, 1010-1019; "Le Christ comme figure de Révélation d'après Saint Jean", in *Révélation de Dieu et langage des hommes*, ed. J. AUDINET et al. (Paris 1972) 51-75.

hannine passion narrative⁽⁵⁾. John's use of them helps articulate a grouping of five scenes (18,1-11; 18,12-27; 18,28-19,16a; 19,16b-37; 19,38-42), notably the first three⁽⁶⁾. Each of these first three, however, is not equally set off from the others; the first two are more closely connected than is the second with the third. Even the pattern of exits and entrances differs, occurring near the opening of each of the first two passages (18,1,4; cp. ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ, 18,3; and 18,15,16) rather than as a constant feature of its development, as in the third (18,28-19,16a)⁽⁷⁾. More important, however, is the different handling of two transitions, vv. 12-13 and v. 28. Ἄγειν may be

⁽⁵⁾ To some extent, this may be found in other Evangelists; cp. Matt 26,58 εἰσελθὼν and 26,75 ἐξελθὼν (altering the Marcan terminology in both cases, and consciously framing the whole hearing before Caiaphas by noting Peter's role). Luke regularly divides the passion scenes in such a way as to reflect his journey motif: Luke 22,39, "went out on his way"; but then: "they led him (away...)" in 22,54 (insistently); 22,66; 23,1,26,32 — with the intervening "sent" in 23,7,11,15 — until 23,33, the end of the way to the cross: ὅτε ἦλθον ἐπὶ....

⁽⁶⁾ The last, introduced by μετὰ ταῦτα (19,38), which marks more significant divisions elsewhere in John (3,22; 5,1,14; 7,1; 21,8) in comparison with μετὰ τοῦτο (19,28; cf. 2,12; 11,7,11), may be classified as an "epilogue". The climactic moment of John's passion narrative is surely that of Jesus' death (19,30) as the moment of his communicating the Spirit, along with the attestation of the significance of his death (19,31-37).

The epilogue also mentions some movement (ἦλθεν vv. 38 and 39) but, suggestively, not to another place (cf. vv. 41-42). The major movement of the passion story stops on Golgotha, with Jesus on the cross, in the "central position" (19,18b).

Except for what one finds in the commentaries and in A. J. de Varenbeke's study (cf. n. 3), no more recent structural studies of John's passion narrative have appeared. Cf. Jürgen BECKER, "Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium (1978-1980)", *TRu* 47 (1982) 279-301 and 305-347, esp. 280-284, and Hartwig THYEN, "Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium", *TRu* 39 (1974) 1-69, esp. 4-44; 222-252; 289-330; *TRu* 42 (1977) 211-270; *TRu* 43 (1978) 328-359; *TRu* 44 (1979) 97-134.

⁽⁷⁾ To be noted in the development of 18,28-19,16a is not only the "outside / inside" pattern, but also the *over-all progression*: until 18,40, Pilate deals with Jesus and with the Jews separately, "and then" (19,1) he has Jesus scourged; with 19,4, Pilate, Jesus, and the Jews are all engaged within each of the three scenes, for even "inside", in 19,8-12, the Jews' voices are heard (v. 11), "and then", at the end of the two-stage progression in the whole passage, Pilate hands Jesus over to be crucified (19,16a).

taken in 18,13 (with the preceding portion of the sentence, v. 12)⁽⁸⁾ as introducing the second scene, much as it introduces the third (v. 28). Nevertheless, a curious, disjunctive preterition stands between the second and third scenes, just before v. 28 (all the more curious because of *πρῶτον* in v. 13a). John does not mention what took place before Caiaphas. Furthermore, he makes no reference in the third scene to the presence of disciples (even 18,36 does not allude to them), whereas he repeatedly draws attention to their physical presence, notably that of Peter (18,10.11.15-18.25-27) in both of the preceding scenes. The insistence on specified, personal association of Jesus and his disciples arrests one's attention, especially when one compares John's account with those of the Synoptics, where the disciples flee (Mark; Matt) and even Peter follows "from afar" (Mark; Matt; Luke).

Although priority should be given to John's narrative considered as theological narrative, the much-discussed question of his sources cannot blithely be dismissed⁽⁹⁾. Scholars' attention to them commands respect, even though it does not determine the primary concern of exegesis. Moreover, the question of sources does bear on the "material cause" of the text and on the probable circumstances of its composition. The problem of sources, however, should not preoccupy the exegete's concerns. As D. Moody Smith has perspicaciously suggested⁽¹⁰⁾, the Fourth Evangelist, especially if he wrote at a late date in the first century, was probably not unaware of the Synoptics. He remarks that, at the outset, it may seem less difficult and, therefore, more reasonable, to explain the occasional similarities between John and the Synoptics by supposing that he did not know them, than to explain the wide divergences on the supposition that he did know them. Sidestepping this narrowly-focused explanation (which seems to be based on a text-critical mode of logic: *lectio difficilior potior*), Smith goes on to observe that, upon further reflection,

(8) The object after *ἤγγαρον* is implied, so v. 13 must be taken as part of the sentence which begins with v. 12 (cp. 19,19.13).

(9) This is particularly true when the final structure gives clear signs of having resulted from alterations to a previously existing form of the text; cf. C. H. GIBLIN, "Two Complementary Literary Structures in John 1:1-18", *JBL* (forthcoming, 1984).

(10) D. M. SMITH, "John and the Synoptics: Some Dimensions of the Problem", *NTS* 26 (1979-80) 425-444, 443-444.

it was the life, interests, and controversies of the Johannine community itself which probably provided the primary material and inspiration for the author of the Fourth Gospel. Understandably, then, John wrote rather independently of those whose works he knew.

Even in the area of the closest similarity, the passion narrative, it is impossible to show direct dependence on any of the Synoptics as a literary source, sc., as documents or portions of them to be reworked into a new composition (as, for example, Luke reworked Mark and Q)⁽¹¹⁾. At best, we may find traces of an earlier but still distinctively Johannine tradition which had already been shaped with some knowledge of the Synoptics⁽¹²⁾. Whether or not there existed at an even earlier stage an independent literary source for the Johannine passion narrative which was reworked in Johannine circles may have to remain an unanswered question. John certainly writes in an original way, with a consciousness, endorsed by the final redactor, of being an independent and genuine witness to the meaning of Jesus, specifically, to *who* (not just *what*) *he is* (cf. John 19,35-37; 21,24). Is it unlikely that earlier, written "sources" — or retold, cohesive oral traditions — were again and again reshaped within the Johannine community, perhaps with an ear to details in stories told by visiting Christians from elsewhere? Surely, John's community did not exist in some social or cultural bayou, but more probably was situated in a significant urban center like Ephesus. Be that as it may, even if an earlier stage of the Johannine account could be set down with persuasive probability, the exegete would do well to resist the temptation to detect the final Johannine theology primarily in the material as he hypothesizes the Evangelist altered or developed it. Ultimately, he must find the norm for his interpretation in the final composition as a coherent, literary whole, with its own internal correspondences and developments, as the Evangelist's attentive reader would be expected to do. In short, he should look to the point of the story and to its purpose as disclosed in its telling⁽¹³⁾.

⁽¹¹⁾ Anton DAUER, *Die Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und theologische Untersuchung zu Joh 18,1-19,30* (München 1972) 336.

⁽¹²⁾ R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium* III (Freiburg i/B 1976) 274-275, 256. Cf. also DAUER, *Passionsgeschichte*, notwithstanding many weighty objections by M. SABBE, BETL 44 (1977) 203-234.

⁽¹³⁾ The exegete's function is not specifically to engage in speculative

It may prove most helpful, then, following the plot-line and structure of the texts, to attend to motifs which build upon earlier passages in the Fourth Gospel, and to analogical comparison with the Synoptics which may set in relief John's distinctiveness⁽¹⁴⁾. As every Irishman knows, the meaning of a story lies largely in the way it is told. For each storyteller wants himself to be understood appreciatively through his own way of telling the tale, whether that tale is not as yet known or, and indeed preferably, if it already is. That is how the storyteller functions as a teacher.

We may now proceed to examine the two first scenes of John's passion narrative⁽¹⁵⁾.

JOHN 18,1-11

The introductory verses (1-3) of this first major scene prepare for the main confrontation (vv. 4-9) within it. Jesus' exit with his disciples and his entrance into the garden tightly unify the opening verse. Judas then comes with a complement of the adversaries of Jesus (vv. 2-3). All the verbs describe only Jesus' action of going out and then going in with his disciples, his gathering there with them, and Judas's going there taking troops and servants from the Jewish authorities. V. 2b, again associating Jesus with his disciples (but not placed within v. 1, where it would more likely have suggested simply a custom on Jesus' part; cp. Luke 22,39), already hints that the betrayer is no longer numbered among that group. He is not presented as "one of the Twelve" who acts as a guide by identifying Jesus or by singling him out with a feigned greeting (Mark 14,43-45 pars.). A mob does not accompany him (Mark; Matt), nor does he lead a mob in which high priests, temple officers or other authorities appear in the same scene (Luke). The tribune mentioned

Church history (e.g., the reconstruction of the Johannine community and its "sectarian interests") but to investigate *all the causes* of the text. Reconstructions (e.g., of the Johannine community) may be useful, and at times necessary, in serving that end, but they should not dictate the interpretation of a text from which they have hypothetically been construed.

(¹⁴) For an example of the method, cf. C. H. GIBLIN, "The Miraculous Crossing of the Sea (John 6. 16-21)", *NTS* 29 (1983) 96-103.

(¹⁵) The text supposed is that of *UBSGNT*⁴ or *NA*²⁶.

subsequently (v. 12), when Judas is no longer of interest, does not appear here. Rather, Judas comes "taking" (λαμβάν) these troops and servants. *Pace* R. E. Brown⁽¹⁶⁾, Judas appears rather as the leader, not just a guide, of those about to arrest Jesus, although, as we shall see, his role as a leader seems symbolic; he certainly is not presented here (or elsewhere in John, for that matter), as "authorized" by the high priests or others.

The lineup of adversaries represents a wide spectrum of those who have been or will prove to be hostile to Jesus. The whole ministry of Jesus seems to find its most critical moment in the passion narrative, beginning with this initial scene of confrontation. Pharisees are nowhere mentioned in the passion narratives given by the Synoptics. Matthew alone, in his burial-resurrection narrative⁽¹⁷⁾, notes their role in arranging a guard at the tomb and in bribing them after the resurrection. He does so largely to integrate that narrative with Jesus' prophetic words to the Pharisees concerning his disappearance (the Sign of Jonah). Jesus' personal confrontation of them in his passion, however, does not figure among Matthew's concerns. John's notation of the Pharisees' agency here helps to integrate his own passion narrative with earlier portions of his Gospel, notably the decision taken by the Sanhedrin (11,47-53), which he says was convened by Pharisees as well as by high priests (11,47a). At the beginning of the next major scene, he will refer more clearly to the same meeting in recalling the counsel of the high priest Caiaphas (18,14). Perhaps by the time John's Gospel reached its final form, the distinction between Pharisees and Sadducees (the priestly class) was no longer operative and tended to become obscured (cp. John 1,19 and 1,24); both high priests and Pharisees soon appear simply as "the Jews" (18,12). Nevertheless, noting the agency of both groups here helps bring to bear on the passion narrative all the more strikingly the hostility of the Jewish leadership as a whole and their decision in 11,53.

Mention of Roman troops (in the forefront of the group led by

⁽¹⁶⁾ R. E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John (XIII-XXI)* (Garden City 1970) 807.

⁽¹⁷⁾ C. H. GIBLIN, "Structural and Thematic Correlations in the Matthean Burial-Resurrection Narrative (Matt. xxvii. 57-xxviii. 20)", *NTS* 21 (1974-75) 406-420, 413-419.

Judas) stands out even more surprisingly. I find it unlikely, especially if one foregoes attempts to harmonize John with the Synoptics, that the σπεῖρα (properly a "cohort" or a representative detachment of it) is intended to mean something other than or in addition to Roman troops. John repeats the term in v. 12 and adds the term for the military tribune (χιλίαρχος), again distinguishing these soldiers from the servants or police (ὑπηρέται) of the Jews. This appearance of Roman soldiers is unheralded by anything earlier in the Fourth Gospel. It is arguable that John relies on historical tradition here, or on the historical probability that ecclesiastical politicians fearful of the Romans' power to depose them (cf. 11,48) would have by some means obtained a Roman detachment to secure their own covert operation against Jesus. Considering historical probability, however, one would still judge that John exaggerates the size of the force, not to mention the rank he assigns its commanding officer. Exaggeration would not hurt, however, in making more perceptible a subtle theological suggestion. In line with Schnackenburg's comments⁽¹⁸⁾, one may best construe John's remarks about Roman troops in 18,3.12 as intended to place the focus of the passion narrative on a confrontation with the world which reaches its climax in the scene before Pilate (and is perhaps documented by the polyglot title on the cross)⁽¹⁹⁾.

Two circumstantial details, the designation of the place as a garden and the mention of the arrival of Jesus' adversaries with lanterns and torches as well as weapons, invite comment. In a writer as dramatic and sparingly selective of details as John, these features are hardly to be judged otiose, though the tone they impart to the narrative may not be helped by or even allow conceptualization. The double mention of instruments of light (φανοὶ καὶ λαμπάδες) may well be intended to help contrast this group with one who, throughout the Gospel, has appeared as the genuine light for the

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Johannesevangelium* III, 251.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Confrontation (e.g., with the world), need not imply the lack of an implicit "appeal", notably in Jesus' private dialogue with Pilate and in the official, secular and biblical testimonials to the scope and meaning of Jesus' death (19,19-22.28-30.31-37). A similar paradox occurs in the attitude towards the world in John 17. It is important to note this, as Prof. Freed did in his critique of an earlier version of this paper, given in the Seminar on the Fourth Gospel at the S.N.T.S. meeting in Rome, August, 1981.

world⁽²⁰⁾, and whose closing words to the crowd were that they should believe in the light while they had it (12,36, echoed in 12,46). It also accords with the dramatic notice that, when Judas went out from the supper scene, it was night (13,30b).

The other circumstantial detail, the "garden" (v. 1), occurs again at the end of the passion narrative (19,21) and apropos of Peter's third denial (18,26b: "Did I myself not see you in the garden with him?"). Obviously, the garden in 19,21 is a quite different place. The term apparently functions as a motif, suggesting a place apart and close association between Jesus and his disciples or between Jesus and those, like Nicodemus, who respect him. The motif recurs anew in 20,15, with the pregnant suggestion of "the one in charge" of the garden, and, again, in a context of close, personal association between Jesus and one who has been loyal to him. The slight inconsistency in the two opening scenes of the passion narrative, namely, that Jesus confronts his adversaries *outside* the garden (18,4) whereas Peter is addressed as having been seen *in* the garden, supports this interpretation. For it seems odd that a writer who makes so much of "ins" and "outs" in his concise narrative, as John does, would have been unaware of this discrepancy. Perhaps he let it stand or introduced it for its suggestive value. The emphasis in the question put to Peter falls on his personal, immediate association with Jesus: "*with him* in the garden". Thus, mention of the garden may have perceptible theological overtones not as vulnerable to sound exegetical criticism as is Hoskyns' Eden-typology⁽²¹⁾.

The chief confrontation (vv. 4-9) in this scene stresses Jesus' initiative in both of its two stages (vv. 4-6 and 7-9). He twice poses the same question to the entire group of his adversaries and twice identifies himself as Jesus the Nazorean by using the humanly unostentatious and divinely sovereign ἐγώ εἰμι. The two stages of the confrontation serve not only to underscore the sovereign freedom of Jesus, but also vividly to contrast in relation to him two different groups. Jesus figures as the point of division and definition. Judas is aligned with the opposition (v. 5). Jesus' disciples, characterized as "those you have given me", which, in the light of 17,12 and 6,64-65, certainly excludes Judas, are mentioned only in the second stage

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. R. E. BROWN, *Gospel of John* II, 817.

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. DAUER, *Passionsgeschichte*, 28.

of the encounter (vv. 7-9). Jesus' power and freedom to defend himself, demonstrated by the dramatic action following his self-identification in v. 6, finds its explanation in the second stage as concern for the disciples in accordance with his own stated acknowledgment of the Father's gift (vv. 8b-9).

A number of scholars have adduced parallels in the psalms or even in apocalyptic literature to the "falling back" of the Lord's adversaries at his self-manifestation⁽²²⁾. Without denying the relevance of these references, I submit that the fulsome formulation of v. 6bc — especially εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω after a form of the second aorist of ἔρχεσθαι (ἀπῆλθον) — and the occurrence of the verse immediately following reference to Judas's standing with them (v. 5c), builds upon the only previous occurrence of this expression, John 6,66. At that point in the narrative, the major test for the disciples was a test of faith. Furthermore, "many of his disciples" were in question. The betrayer himself, described as an unbeliever (6,64-65), was not at that time one of those "who went backwards (ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω)" and no longer walked with Jesus. Judas remained an adversary within the group, a hidden unbeliever, and stayed on as one of the Twelve. With his actual defection, however, announced as "Satan's entering into him" (13,27), he no longer seems to be considered as "one of the Twelve" (6,71) or "one of the disciples" (12,4; cf. 13,1). He falls outside the pale of the command of love that radically governs Jesus' relationship to his disciples and their relationship to one another (13,31-35). The narrative of the passion, which follows as an exemplification of Jesus' farewell discourses to his disciples about their interrelationships and the antipathy of the world (cf. ταῦτα εἰπὼν, 18,1)⁽²³⁾, underscores in this opening scene the division between disciples and hostile non-disciples. The passion further actualizes the divided reactions to the Bread of Life discourse, at which time the link to Jesus' "ascension", that is, to his

⁽²²⁾ The verb ἀπελθεῖν does not occur in the Psalms usually cited: Pss 27(26),2, ἔπescαν; 35(34),4, ἀποστραφῆτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω; 56(55),10, ἐπιστρέψουσιν. . . εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω. For the discussion, cf. BROWN, *Gospel of John II*, 818 and especially DAUER, *Passionsgeschichte*, 41-43.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. Felix PORSCHE, *Pneuma und Wort. Ein Exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Frankfurt a/M 1974) 356, citing I. de la Potterie.

Confrontations in John 18,1-27

All four Gospels are narratives, that is, they are basically stories⁽¹⁾. Stories always deal with persons, what they do and / or say, how they interact, where, when, etc. One cannot tell a story without at least personifying the chief actors. Their interaction determines the plot-line of the narrative and the meaning of the whole story. As a story moves to its climax, the author's presentation of its chief characters may be expected to prove critically important for the audience's perception of its relevance to themselves. Accordingly, one may expect a given Evangelist to disclose his theology in terms of his chosen medium, the story, particularly as he brings the narrative to its climax and more closely interrelates the actions of the chief character, Jesus, both with those of his disciples and with those of his adversaries⁽²⁾. Needless to say, the passion-resurrection narrative

⁽¹⁾ The fact that the term "story" covers epics and dramas as well does not diminish its importance in the study of narrative. Nor should the further problem concerning "Gospel genre" distract one from the need to affirm that "story-form" is an issue central to literary criticism of the narrative-style Gospels. "Gospel" covers literary genres / forms other than narratives and so "Gospel genre" must be regarded as an analogous concept. For it can hardly exclude Paul's preaching, especially his speech in Rom 1,16-8,39, which is definitely not a narrative, but an argumentative exposition based on the attested fact of Jesus' death for us on the cross and his transforming bodily resurrection from the dead. That attested fact is what determines "the Gospel" — whatever literary forms the latter assumes. Even among the Four Gospels, its literary form (not to mention its literary structure) is analogous. Mark presents only its "beginning", and that as a kind of apocalyptic manifesto. Luke recasts it as a kind of religious history. John seems to present it as the attested eschatological theophany, the final and definitive manifestation of God as the Father and his Son Jesus Christ, who communicate the Spirit and provide everlasting life to believers.

⁽²⁾ For treatment of this topic in Mark, cf. R. C. TANNEHILL, "The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role", *JR* 57 (1977) 386-405. Similar approaches should be worked out for the other three Gospels. In my opinion, Tannehill has put his finger on the major axis of any Christian,

functions as the lodestone of every one of the story-form Gospels; the passion in particular stands out as the climactic "conflict" or "confrontation" in the plot-line of the Gospels.

Consequently, a reading of the Fourth Evangelist's passion narrative (John 18,1-19,42) from the way he tells the story, rather than, let us say, from an analysis of his sources or of the formal structure of his narrative or of its historical probability⁽³⁾, may come as a refreshingly simple and rewarding experience, providing solid insights into John's understanding of how Jesus' "personal revelation"⁽⁴⁾ works out. The compass of this paper requires that only a portion of John's passion-story be explored. Moreover, prudence dictates that one begin at the beginning. If only on these scores, then, this essay in theological exegesis should be limited to John 18,1-27.

Further reasons for so delimiting the study while at the same time including two distinguishable components (18,1-11 and 18,12-27) find their grounds in the movement of the narrative. Careful attention to entrances and exits distinguishes the staging of the Jo-

evangelical (i.e., gospel-form) communication, namely, the relation of Jesus to his disciples as realized through the passion-resurrection.

The interrelationships of Jesus, his disciples, and adversaries of both becomes quite marked from John 11 onwards. Before that (except perhaps for John 6) it is much less pronounced than it is in the Synoptics' account of the public ministry (e.g., Mark 2,13-28 pars.).

⁽³⁾ For a judicious review of recent monographs on the topic, cf. D. MOODY SMITH, "John and the Synoptics", *Bib* 63 (1982) 102-113. The question of sources seems disproportionately to dominate discussion of the Fourth Gospel. Study of the formal structure of the text may result in a narrow, static view of the composition, at the expense of other lines of interpretation, e.g., as in A. JANSSENS DE VAREBEKE, "La structure des scènes du récit de la passion en Joh. XVIII-XIX", *ETL* 38 (1962) 504-522. A historically-oriented approach is even less rewarding, as in J. SCHNEIDER, "Zur Komposition von Jo 18,12-17: Kaiphas und Hannas", *ZNW* 48 (1957) 111-119.

In looking for the *causes* of the text, as the scientific aspect of the exegete's task requires (the rest is art!), attention must be paid not only to the matter used by the author, or to its form, but also to the movement of the passage and, above all, to the end or *purpose* of the communication, the *causa causarum*. The rationale for this approach is unabashedly Aristotelian.

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. I. DE LA POTTERIE, *La Vérité dans Saint Jean* (AnBib 73-74; Rome 1977) II, 1010-1019; "Le Christ comme figure de Révélation d'après Saint Jean", in *Révélation de Dieu et langage des hommes*, ed. J. AUDINET et al. (Paris 1972) 51-75.

hannine passion narrative⁽⁵⁾. John's use of them helps articulate a grouping of five scenes (18,1-11; 18,12-27; 18,28-19,16a; 19,16b-37; 19,38-42), notably the first three⁽⁶⁾. Each of these first three, however, is not equally set off from the others; the first two are more closely connected than is the second with the third. Even the pattern of exits and entrances differs, occurring near the opening of each of the first two passages (18,1,4; cp. *ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ*, 18,3; and 18,15,16) rather than as a constant feature of its development, as in the third (18,28-19,16a)⁽⁷⁾. More important, however, is the different handling of two transitions, vv. 12-13 and v. 28. *Ἄγειν* may be

⁽⁵⁾ To some extent, this may be found in other Evangelists; cp. Matt 26,58 *εἰσελθὼν* and 26,75 *ἐξελθὼν* (altering the Marcan terminology in both cases, and consciously framing the whole hearing before Caiaphas by noting Peter's role). Luke regularly divides the passion scenes in such a way as to reflect his journey motif: Luke 22,39, "went out on his way"; but then: "they led him (away...)" in 22,54 (insistently); 22,66; 23,1,26,32 — with the intervening "sent" in 23,7,11,15 — until 23,33, the end of the way to the cross: *ὅτε ἦλθον ἐπὶ...*

⁽⁶⁾ The last, introduced by *μετὰ ταῦτα* (19,38), which marks more significant divisions elsewhere in John (3,22; 5,1,14; 7,1; 21,8) in comparison with *μετὰ τοῦτο* (19,28; cf. 2,12; 11,7,11), may be classified as an "epilogue". The climactic moment of John's passion narrative is surely that of Jesus' death (19,30) as the moment of his communicating the Spirit, along with the attestation of the significance of his death (19,31-37).

The epilogue also mentions some movement (*ἦλθεν* vv. 38 and 39) but, suggestively, not to another place (cf. vv. 41-42). The major movement of the passion story stops on Golgotha, with Jesus on the cross, in the "central position" (19,18b).

Except for what one finds in the commentaries and in A. J. de Varenbeke's study (cf. n. 3), no more recent structural studies of John's passion narrative have appeared. Cf. Jürgen BECKER, "Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium (1978-1980)", *TRu* 47 (1982) 279-301 and 305-347, esp. 280-284, and Hartwig THYEN, "Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium", *TRu* 39 (1974) 1-69, esp. 4-44; 222-252; 289-330; *TRu* 42 (1977) 211-270; *TRu* 43 (1978) 328-359; *TRu* 44 (1979) 97-134.

⁽⁷⁾ To be noted in the development of 18,28-19,16a is not only the "outside / inside" pattern, but also the *over-all progression*: until 18,40, Pilate deals with Jesus and with the Jews separately, "and then" (19,1) he has Jesus scourged; with 19,4, Pilate, Jesus, and the Jews are all engaged within each of the three scenes, for even "inside", in 19,8-12, the Jews' voices are heard (v. 11), "and then", at the end of the two-stage progression in the whole passage, Pilate hands Jesus over to be crucified (19,16a).

taken in 18,13 (with the preceding portion of the sentence, v. 12)⁽⁸⁾ as introducing the second scene, much as it introduces the third (v. 28). Nevertheless, a curious, disjunctive preterition stands between the second and third scenes, just before v. 28 (all the more curious because of *πρῶτον* in v. 13a). John does not mention what took place before Caiaphas. Furthermore, he makes no reference in the third scene to the presence of disciples (even 18,36 does not allude to them), whereas he repeatedly draws attention to their physical presence, notably that of Peter (18,10.11.15-18.25-27) in both of the preceding scenes. The insistence on specified, personal association of Jesus and his disciples arrests one's attention, especially when one compares John's account with those of the Synoptics, where the disciples flee (Mark; Matt) and even Peter follows "from afar" (Mark; Matt; Luke).

Although priority should be given to John's narrative considered as theological narrative, the much-discussed question of his sources cannot blithely be dismissed⁽⁹⁾. Scholars' attention to them commands respect, even though it does not determine the primary concern of exegesis. Moreover, the question of sources does bear on the "material cause" of the text and on the probable circumstances of its composition. The problem of sources, however, should not preoccupy the exegete's concerns. As D. Moody Smith has perspicaciously suggested⁽¹⁰⁾, the Fourth Evangelist, especially if he wrote at a late date in the first century, was probably not unaware of the Synoptics. He remarks that, at the outset, it may seem less difficult and, therefore, more reasonable, to explain the occasional similarities between John and the Synoptics by supposing that he did not know them, than to explain the wide divergences on the supposition that he did know them. Sidestepping this narrowly-focused explanation (which seems to be based on a text-critical mode of logic: *lectio difficilior potior*), Smith goes on to observe that, upon further reflection,

(8) The object after *ἤγγαρον* is implied, so v. 13 must be taken as part of the sentence which begins with v. 12 (cp. 19,19.13).

(9) This is particularly true when the final structure gives clear signs of having resulted from alterations to a previously existing form of the text; cf. C. H. GIBLIN, "Two Complementary Literary Structures in John 1:1-18", *JBL* (forthcoming, 1984).

(10) D. M. SMITH, "John and the Synoptics: Some Dimensions of the Problem", *NTS* 26 (1979-80) 425-444, 443-444.

it was the life, interests, and controversies of the Johannine community itself which probably provided the primary material and inspiration for the author of the Fourth Gospel. Understandably, then, John wrote rather independently of those whose works he knew.

Even in the area of the closest similarity, the passion narrative, it is impossible to show direct dependence on any of the Synoptics as a literary source, sc., as documents or portions of them to be reworked into a new composition (as, for example, Luke reworked Mark and Q)⁽¹¹⁾. At best, we may find traces of an earlier but still distinctively Johannine tradition which had already been shaped with some knowledge of the Synoptics⁽¹²⁾. Whether or not there existed at an even earlier stage an independent literary source for the Johannine passion narrative which was reworked in Johannine circles may have to remain an unanswered question. John certainly writes in an original way, with a consciousness, endorsed by the final redactor, of being an independent and genuine witness to the meaning of Jesus, specifically, to *who* (not just *what*) *he is* (cf. John 19,35-37; 21,24). Is it unlikely that earlier, written "sources" — or retold, cohesive oral traditions — were again and again reshaped within the Johannine community, perhaps with an ear to details in stories told by visiting Christians from elsewhere? Surely, John's community did not exist in some social or cultural bayou, but more probably was situated in a significant urban center like Ephesus. Be that as it may, even if an earlier stage of the Johannine account could be set down with persuasive probability, the exegete would do well to resist the temptation to detect the final Johannine theology primarily in the material as he hypothesizes the Evangelist altered or developed it. Ultimately, he must find the norm for his interpretation in the final composition as a coherent, literary whole, with its own internal correspondences and developments, as the Evangelist's attentive reader would be expected to do. In short, he should look to the point of the story and to its purpose as disclosed in its telling⁽¹³⁾.

(11) Anton DAUER, *Die Passionsgeschichte im Johannesevangelium. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und theologische Untersuchung zu Joh 18,1-19,30* (München 1972) 336.

(12) R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium* III (Freiburg i/B 1976) 274-275, 256. Cf. also DAUER, *Passionsgeschichte*, notwithstanding many weighty objections by M. SABBE, BETL 44 (1977) 203-234.

(13) The exegete's function is not specifically to engage in speculative

It may prove most helpful, then, following the plot-line and structure of the texts, to attend to motifs which build upon earlier passages in the Fourth Gospel, and to analogical comparison with the Synoptics which may set in relief John's distinctiveness⁽¹⁴⁾. As every Irishman knows, the meaning of a story lies largely in the way it is told. For each storyteller wants himself to be understood appreciatively through his own way of telling the tale, whether that tale is not as yet known or, and indeed preferably, if it already is. That is how the storyteller functions as a teacher.

We may now proceed to examine the two first scenes of John's passion narrative⁽¹⁵⁾.

JOHN 18,1-11

The introductory verses (1-3) of this first major scene prepare for the main confrontation (vv. 4-9) within it. Jesus' exit with his disciples and his entrance into the garden tightly unify the opening verse. Judas then comes with a complement of the adversaries of Jesus (vv. 2-3). All the verbs describe only Jesus' action of going out and then going in with his disciples, his gathering there with them, and Judas's going there taking troops and servants from the Jewish authorities. V. 2b, again associating Jesus with his disciples (but not placed within v. 1, where it would more likely have suggested simply a custom on Jesus' part; cp. Luke 22,39), already hints that the betrayer is no longer numbered among that group. He is not presented as "one of the Twelve" who acts as a guide by identifying Jesus or by singling him out with a feigned greeting (Mark 14,43-45 pars.). A mob does not accompany him (Mark; Matt), nor does he lead a mob in which high priests, temple officers or other authorities appear in the same scene (Luke). The tribune mentioned

Church history (e.g., the reconstruction of the Johannine community and its "sectarian interests") but to investigate *all the causes* of the text. Reconstructions (e.g., of the Johannine community) may be useful, and at times necessary, in serving that end, but they should not dictate the interpretation of a text from which they have hypothetically been construed.

(¹⁴) For an example of the method, cf. C. H. GIBLIN, "The Miraculous Crossing of the Sea (John 6. 16-21)", *NTS* 29 (1983) 96-103.

(¹⁵) The text supposed is that of *UBSGNT*⁴ or *NA*²⁶.

subsequently (v. 12), when Judas is no longer of interest, does not appear here. Rather, Judas comes "taking" (λαμβάν) these troops and servants. *Pace* R. E. Brown⁽¹⁶⁾, Judas appears rather as the leader, not just a guide, of those about to arrest Jesus, although, as we shall see, his role as a leader seems symbolic; he certainly is not presented here (or elsewhere in John, for that matter), as "authorized" by the high priests or others.

The lineup of adversaries represents a wide spectrum of those who have been or will prove to be hostile to Jesus. The whole ministry of Jesus seems to find its most critical moment in the passion narrative, beginning with this initial scene of confrontation. Pharisees are nowhere mentioned in the passion narratives given by the Synoptics. Matthew alone, in his burial-resurrection narrative⁽¹⁷⁾, notes their role in arranging a guard at the tomb and in bribing them after the resurrection. He does so largely to integrate that narrative with Jesus' prophetic words to the Pharisees concerning his disappearance (the Sign of Jonah). Jesus' personal confrontation of them in his passion, however, does not figure among Matthew's concerns. John's notation of the Pharisees' agency here helps to integrate his own passion narrative with earlier portions of his Gospel, notably the decision taken by the Sanhedrin (11,47-53), which he says was convened by Pharisees as well as by high priests (11,47a). At the beginning of the next major scene, he will refer more clearly to the same meeting in recalling the counsel of the high priest Caiaphas (18,14). Perhaps by the time John's Gospel reached its final form, the distinction between Pharisees and Sadducees (the priestly class) was no longer operative and tended to become obscured (cp. John 1,19 and 1,24); both high priests and Pharisees soon appear simply as "the Jews" (18,12). Nevertheless, noting the agency of both groups here helps bring to bear on the passion narrative all the more strikingly the hostility of the Jewish leadership as a whole and their decision in 11,53.

Mention of Roman troops (in the forefront of the group led by

⁽¹⁶⁾ R. E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John (XIII-XXI)* (Garden City 1970) 807.

⁽¹⁷⁾ C. H. GIBLIN, "Structural and Thematic Correlations in the Matthean Burial-Resurrection Narrative (Matt. xxvii. 57-xxviii. 20)", *NTS* 21 (1974-75) 406-420, 413-419.

Judas) stands out even more surprisingly. I find it unlikely, especially if one foregoes attempts to harmonize John with the Synoptics, that the σπεῖρα (properly a "cohort" or a representative detachment of it) is intended to mean something other than or in addition to Roman troops. John repeats the term in v. 12 and adds the term for the military tribune (χιλίαρχος), again distinguishing these soldiers from the servants or police (ὑπηρέται) of the Jews. This appearance of Roman soldiers is unheralded by anything earlier in the Fourth Gospel. It is arguable that John relies on historical tradition here, or on the historical probability that ecclesiastical politicians fearful of the Romans' power to depose them (cf. 11,48) would have by some means obtained a Roman detachment to secure their own covert operation against Jesus. Considering historical probability, however, one would still judge that John exaggerates the size of the force, not to mention the rank he assigns its commanding officer. Exaggeration would not hurt, however, in making more perceptible a subtle theological suggestion. In line with Schnackenburg's comments⁽¹⁸⁾, one may best construe John's remarks about Roman troops in 18,3.12 as intended to place the focus of the passion narrative on a confrontation with the world which reaches its climax in the scene before Pilate (and is perhaps documented by the polyglot title on the cross)⁽¹⁹⁾.

Two circumstantial details, the designation of the place as a garden and the mention of the arrival of Jesus' adversaries with lanterns and torches as well as weapons, invite comment. In a writer as dramatic and sparingly selective of details as John, these features are hardly to be judged otiose, though the tone they impart to the narrative may not be helped by or even allow conceptualization. The double mention of instruments of light (φανοὶ καὶ λαμπάδες) may well be intended to help contrast this group with one who, throughout the Gospel, has appeared as the genuine light for the

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Johannesevangelium* III, 251.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Confrontation (e.g., with the world), need not imply the lack of an implicit "appeal", notably in Jesus' private dialogue with Pilate and in the official, secular and biblical testimonials to the scope and meaning of Jesus' death (19,19-22.28-30.31-37). A similar paradox occurs in the attitude towards the world in John 17. It is important to note this, as Prof. Freed did in his critique of an earlier version of this paper, given in the Seminar on the Fourth Gospel at the S.N.T.S. meeting in Rome, August, 1981.

world⁽²⁰⁾, and whose closing words to the crowd were that they should believe in the light while they had it (12,36, echoed in 12,46). It also accords with the dramatic notice that, when Judas went out from the supper scene, it was night (13,30b).

The other circumstantial detail, the "garden" (v. 1), occurs again at the end of the passion narrative (19,21) and apropos of Peter's third denial (18,26b: "Did I myself not see you in the garden with him?"). Obviously, the garden in 19,21 is a quite different place. The term apparently functions as a motif, suggesting a place apart and close association between Jesus and his disciples or between Jesus and those, like Nicodemus, who respect him. The motif recurs anew in 20,15, with the pregnant suggestion of "the one in charge" of the garden, and, again, in a context of close, personal association between Jesus and one who has been loyal to him. The slight inconsistency in the two opening scenes of the passion narrative, namely, that Jesus confronts his adversaries *outside* the garden (18,4) whereas Peter is addressed as having been seen *in* the garden, supports this interpretation. For it seems odd that a writer who makes so much of "ins" and "outs" in his concise narrative, as John does, would have been unaware of this discrepancy. Perhaps he let it stand or introduced it for its suggestive value. The emphasis in the question put to Peter falls on his personal, immediate association with Jesus: "*with him* in the garden". Thus, mention of the garden may have perceptible theological overtones not as vulnerable to sound exegetical criticism as is Hoskyns' Eden-typology⁽²¹⁾.

The chief confrontation (vv. 4-9) in this scene stresses Jesus' initiative in both of its two stages (vv. 4-6 and 7-9). He twice poses the same question to the entire group of his adversaries and twice identifies himself as Jesus the Nazorean by using the humanly unostentatious and divinely sovereign ἐγώ εἰμι. The two stages of the confrontation serve not only to underscore the sovereign freedom of Jesus, but also vividly to contrast in relation to him two different groups. Jesus figures as the point of division and definition. Judas is aligned with the opposition (v. 5). Jesus' disciples, characterized as "those you have given me", which, in the light of 17,12 and 6,64-65, certainly excludes Judas, are mentioned only in the second stage

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. R. E. BROWN, *Gospel of John* II, 817.

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. DAUER, *Passionsgeschichte*, 28.

of the encounter (vv. 7-9). Jesus' power and freedom to defend himself, demonstrated by the dramatic action following his self-identification in v. 6, finds its explanation in the second stage as concern for the disciples in accordance with his own stated acknowledgment of the Father's gift (vv. 8b-9).

A number of scholars have adduced parallels in the psalms or even in apocalyptic literature to the "falling back" of the Lord's adversaries at his self-manifestation⁽²²⁾. Without denying the relevance of these references, I submit that the fulsome formulation of v. 6bc — especially εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω after a form of the second aorist of ἔρχεσθαι (ἀπῆλθον) — and the occurrence of the verse immediately following reference to Judas's standing with them (v. 5c), builds upon the only previous occurrence of this expression, John 6,66. At that point in the narrative, the major test for the disciples was a test of faith. Furthermore, "many of his disciples" were in question. The betrayer himself, described as an unbeliever (6,64-65), was not at that time one of those "who went backwards (ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω)" and no longer walked with Jesus. Judas remained an adversary within the group, a hidden unbeliever, and stayed on as one of the Twelve. With his actual defection, however, announced as "Satan's entering into him" (13,27), he no longer seems to be considered as "one of the Twelve" (6,71) or "one of the disciples" (12,4; cf. 13,1). He falls outside the pale of the command of love that radically governs Jesus' relationship to his disciples and their relationship to one another (13,31-35). The narrative of the passion, which follows as an exemplification of Jesus' farewell discourses to his disciples about their interrelationships and the antipathy of the world (cf. ταῦτα εἰπὼν, 18,1)⁽²³⁾, underscores in this opening scene the division between disciples and hostile non-disciples. The passion further actualizes the divided reactions to the Bread of Life discourse, at which time the link to Jesus' "ascension", that is, to his

⁽²²⁾ The verb ἀπελθεῖν does not occur in the Psalms usually cited: Pss 27(26),2, ἔπescαν; 35(34),4, ἀποστραφῆτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω; 56(55),10, ἐπιστρέψουσιν. . . εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω. For the discussion, cf. BROWN, *Gospel of John II*, 818 and especially DAUER, *Passionsgeschichte*, 41-43.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. Felix PORSCHE, *Pneuma und Wort. Ein Exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Frankfurt a/M 1974) 356, citing I. de la Potterie.

passion-glorification, was pointedly phrased (6,61-62). What then appeared as revulsion from Jesus' invitation and self-identification is here demonstrated as impotence before the Lord.

The first major scene closes (vv. 10-11) with another confrontation: Peter's belligerent action and Jesus' rebuke. Some, like Barrett⁽²⁴⁾, explain John's identification of the wielder of the sword and of his victim as an enrichment of earlier tradition with personal details. This kind of interpretation turns out to be short-sighted. It fails to perceive connections within this verse and with other texts in the narrative. John not only names the swordsman but also directs Jesus' reply specifically to the same person — whereas in Matthew and Luke Jesus directs his reply to the disciples generally, and in Mark Jesus seems to ignore the incident as he proceeds to address his captors. In John's account, then, Jesus confronts the swordsman. He rebukes Peter in a pointedly personal way (2nd sg. imv.) and demandingly, interrogatively challenges him to understand Jesus' own paradoxical "gift" from the Father. Peter's action (and perhaps his implied incomprehension of the rebuke) proves to have dire consequences for himself. The occasion for his third denial is provided by a relative of the one whose ear Peter cut off (18,26). Interestingly, Peter does not seem to be in danger of personal assault for his bloody attack on the man's relative; he is confronted on the score of his immediate association with Jesus. Nevertheless, part of Peter's "being put personally on the spot" is the fact that the man who addresses him saw him first-hand (ἐγώ) and was a relative of the one whose ear Peter cut off. The earlier notation of the victim's name serves to reenforce the personal thrust and impact of the final question put to Peter.

The rebuke to Peter serves to bring out not only Jesus' acceptance of the cup given him (a fulfillment of Jesus' freedom rather than a limitation of it, cp. 10,18), but also Peter's lack of understanding regarding Jesus' messianic destiny. With the exception of 13,36-37, which discloses Peter's assumption that Jesus' journey may entail danger, but not Jesus' proximate death, no serious misunderstanding has appeared (notably none apropos of Peter's confession in 6,68-69). Nor does 13,36-37 itself enable us to infer that Peter mis-

(24) C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel According to John* (Philadelphia 1978) 516, 521.

understood Jesus' destiny precisely as that of the Son or of the Son of Man. Peter's incomprehension of the journey of the Son of Man figures prominently in the rebuke directed to him in the Marcan and Matthean accounts of the first passion prediction (Mark 8,31-33 and par.). Even Luke, without singling out Peter's incomprehension (except regarding Jesus' ἔξοδος and his transcendence of Moses and Elijah, Luke 9,33) speaks early of the disciples' lack of understanding of the way of the Son of Man (Luke 9,45; 18,34). Jesus' remark concerning his passion (here, the "cup") as the freely accepted gift from the Father recalls the third Johannine prediction of the passion (12,23-33), which was made in the presence of disciples as well as before the Greeks and the crowds (12,20-29). In that prediction, Jesus spoke of himself as the Son of Man (12,23), but the incomprehension noted (12,29,34) was not attributed to disciples. In 18,11, no indication is given of a response on Peter's part. John seems to leave his reader as well as Peter with the need to ponder Jesus' arresting question. Thus, John repeats an outstanding theme of the synoptic tradition, but in his own way. For disciples, the test of understanding occurs within the passion itself, and the issue of the destiny of the Son of Man focuses on acceptance of the Father's gift by the Son. The *messianic imperative* in John is not precisely that the Messiah must suffer as (or to become effectively) the Son of Man, but that Jesus has come freely to achieve his Father's gracious will.

That this lesson is made clear particularly to Peter may make it carry special weight for the disciples in general (*see below*). The lesson, in any event, is brought to bear on "disciples" in an individual, personal way. Do they really understand what Jesus is about by perceiving who he is? He can be "defined" only relationally, i.e., in relation to his Father, through the way he acts: as the Son, the one who receives from the Father what he is to do.

JOHN 18,12-27(28a)

The second major scene opens with a remarkably lengthy introduction describing the reason for the hearing before Annas and the circumstances of Peter's entry (18,12-14.15-16). It helps us answer two salient questions about this passage even as it requires that we pose them. First, why does John recount the hearing before Annas

and apparently suppress or pass over the hearing before Caiaphas? Second, why is some "other disciple" mentioned — and with considerable attention — along with Peter, but is not here designated as the Beloved Disciple or even specifically as "the other disciple", which would render easier his identification⁽²⁵⁾?

As R. E. Brown has argued against Bultmann⁽²⁶⁾, the interrogation before Annas does not reproduce a tradition similar to that behind the synoptic interrogation before the Sanhedrin but stands as one shaped in a different way. It may be compared to a kind of police interrogation of a newly arrested criminal before any trial procedures are begun. The scope of this hearing, as suggested by Jeremias, Meeks, and Brown, was most likely to get evidence for Jesus' being a false prophet, a charge which would have had political as well as religious implications⁽²⁷⁾. This hearing transpires, without any apparent effect, in the vague charges initially made before Pilate (19,29-30). The scope of this hearing, however, as one attentively reads the story itself, is to highlight Jesus' final, personal declaration to the Jewish authorities (cf. ἐγώ, *ter*: vv. 20-21).

John certainly knew of an additional hearing before Caiaphas⁽²⁸⁾. For he mentions Jesus' being brought before Annas as an event which occurred "first" (v. 13, even acknowledging that πρῶτον in this context may mean "especially", i.e., "first and foremost"). He later adds that Annas sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas (v. 24), and notes in the transitional verse (v. 28a) that they led Jesus from Caiaphas to the pretorium early in the morning. Even his notation of time⁽²⁹⁾ suggests an interval sufficient for a second hearing. If John had a literary source containing the substance of the latter hearing, he seems completely to have suppressed it. On the other hand,

(25) The article appears, for instance, in 20,2, even when this other disciple is first introduced in that scene. On the other hand, John may prefer to leave a disciple anonymous — even the one who becomes later the Beloved Disciple — if he has no distinctively personal role to execute in regard to another, as is the case with the unnamed of "the two disciples" in 1,35-40.

(26) BROWN, *Gospel of John* II, 834-835.

(27) BROWN, *Gospel of John* II, 835.

(28) BARRETT, *Gospel According to John*, 524.

(29) Cf. ARNDT-GINGRICH, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago 1979) 724, on πρῶτ.

some elements may have survived elsewhere. Where else but before Caiaphas would have been a more likely place for grounding in a tradition known to John the distorted charge that Jesus "made himself *king*" (19,12c) as a *development* of "made himself God's Son" (19,7c — which, admittedly, could *by itself* be taken only as echoing the distorted judgments in 5,18; 8,53; 10,33)? For the substance of the hearing before Caiaphas, to judge by the remarkably consistent testimony of the Synoptics, was Jesus' declaration of transcendent royal messiahship, entailing a fusion of Dan 7,13 and Ps 110,1. It can hardly be assumed that John transposed the substance of the hearing before Caiaphas to 11,47-53. The latter scene may partly account for John's dropping the hearing before Caiaphas, but in itself it resembles a situation like that in Mark 14,1 pars., not Mark 14,53-56. There is, after all, no hearing whatsoever in 11,47-53, but only a decision to do away with Jesus, and probably, too, deliberation regarding the means (aor. mid., ἐβουλεύσαντο — though with ἵνα, not πῶς).

According to Schnackenburg⁽³⁰⁾, John's source (presumably his written source) spoke of only *one* high priest. Schnackenburg argues this point largely from the use of the definite article in vv. 24 and 15. He holds that the source spoke of the hearing before Annas, and that John, by adding v. 13, made the link with the official, functioning (*amtierend*) high priest. Even in this hypothesis, John knew of a different hearing, the one before Caiaphas. Again, however, he can hardly have been ignorant of its substance.

Furthermore, it might be argued better that, even if only one hearing is to be assumed in John's literary source, it was that before Caiaphas. The placing of the words "Annas first" (v. 13a) suggests an insertion. Vv. 13-14 prepare for what follows both by alerting the reader to the course of events that has already been decided and by suggesting that the following hearing (before Annas) is not an official process but a *private* interrogation. The remarks both in v. 24 and in v. 28a likewise suggest an insertion of this hearing before Annas into the course of a known literary narrative rather than merely a nod to the role of the functioning high priest. V. 24 concludes the hearing before Annas by picking up from v. 13a the word "bound". Had the hearing before Annas been originally the sole

⁽³⁰⁾ SCHNACKENBURG, *Johannesevangelium* III, 265.

hearing in the account, would this detail have been noted at all at this point, or would it not rather have appeared in connection with v. 28a? Schnackenburg's admission of only one literary source — and that before Annas — also presents us with the serious problem of supposing that John's source contained no account of a Jewish trial or *Prozess* — even a rigged one — and makes more mystifying the strategy of going to Pilate with any charges at all. On the other hand, the vocabulary, structural arrangement (twofold introduction, somewhat as in 18,1-4, and ABA' schema for the scene proper, vv. 17-27), and the evident concern with the role of another disciple are characteristically Johannine⁽³¹⁾. More likely, if there was only one hearing in John's source, it was the one before Caiaphas.

In any case, the hearing before Caiaphas was deliberately subordinated because of its theologically irrelevant content in the Johannine passion narrative as integrated into the entire Gospel. For the Jews (as leaders, people, and even representatives of the world at large), what Jesus has already said requires no further disclosure on his part. For a person like Pilate, the situation is singularly different, and so Jesus gives information to him privately. John prefers to present the question of Jesus' sovereign kingship not initially as a charge that comes from without, much less as one that arises directly from a Jewish legal process.

The principal reason John passed over the events which transpired before Caiaphas is not difficult to detect from this scene as examined in the context of the foregoing Gospel narrative. Inferences may be based both on the essential element of the omitted "trial" and on what John offers his reader in vv. 13-14 and 19-21. Jesus' presentation of himself as a royal Messiah empowered with the divine prerogative of judgment⁽³²⁾, the salient element in the hearing before the Sanhedrin as recounted by the Synoptics, would

⁽³¹⁾ An insertion by John in view of some kind of interrogation of Jesus during which Peter's denials took place (at night) would parallel somewhat the Lucan reworking of the Marcan trial scene. It seems that Luke's version of events can be explained without recourse to the supposition that he followed a different literary source for the passion narrative.

⁽³²⁾ Cf. P. LAMARCHE, "Le 'blasphème' de Jésus devant le Sanhédryn", *RSR* 50 (1962) 74-85. Lamarche's ill-advised arguments for the priority of the Matthean tradition do not impair his solid exegesis of the point of Jesus' reply to the high priest.

be anticlimactic, even out of place, in John's Gospel. From the call of the first disciples (1,35-2,12) through the great controversies of the feasts of Sabbath, Tabernacles, and the Dedication (chaps. 5 and 7-10 and, more subtly, in the intervening chap. 6), John's narrative has, stage by stage (1,19-4,54; 5,1-10,42; 11,1 to this point) made ever clearer Jesus' transcendent messiahship⁽³³⁾. The time for Jesus' own testimony to the world at large, in terms of the ministry among his own people, found its solemn conclusion in 12,36-50. In the scene in which he confronts Annas, Jesus eloquently appeals to what he has already said to the world, that is, "to the Jews", who typify it⁽³⁴⁾. Moreover, as John reminds us in v. 14, the decision to do away with Jesus has already been made (11,53). The current situation⁽³⁵⁾ calls for no further testimony from Jesus himself "to the Jews". Rather, it serves as the *moment of truth* for accepting the public declarations he has made.

The scene before Annas may be regarded as John's Christological substitution (and thus his "reworking") of the scene before Caiaphas⁽³⁶⁾, intended to represent Jesus' final appeal to his own people, but through one of their influential representatives. The non-official, relatively "private" quality of the interrogation ironically sets in relief Jesus' statement about his own openly-given revelation (v. 20). Furthermore, this private scene enables John to highlight the direct, personally challenging aspect of Jesus' way of addressing people. In confronting Annas, Jesus twice uses the 2nd sg. (v. 21: interrog.; imv.). Even in replying to the Jewish servant (τῶν ὑπηρέτων) who struck him, Jesus puts the burden of responding on that particular person (v. 23).

⁽³³⁾ SCHNACKENBURG, *Johannesevangelium* III, 269-270.

⁽³⁴⁾ BARRETT, *Gospel According to John*, 528.

⁽³⁵⁾ One must recognize, of course, that "the current situation" as the "moment of truth" consists of the *whole* passion narrative, not merely of this particular scene; a storyteller cannot express everything in a single, short portion of his well-knit account.

⁽³⁶⁾ Omission of other elements of the hearing before Caiaphas as recounted in any of the Synoptics can be explained easily enough. Had John known of false witnesses, he could readily have omitted them (as Luke did) in favor of Jesus' own statements. The physical abuse of Jesus is sufficiently noted in John 18,22, given especially John's reticence concerning brutal details (cp. John 19,1-3 with Mark 15,16-20 par.), like Luke's.

Dramatically — I hesitate to overuse the word, but it does seem to be the only apposite one — John encloses Jesus' being interrogated within the framework of Peter's denials (vv. 17-18 and 25-27). This does not detract from the central importance of the encounter with Annas and one of the servants, if only because, in an ABA' structure, B usually comprises the heart of the matter. That B should be judged as relatively the most important section should be clear from the subordination of the disciples' entries and of Peter's denials of discipleship to the statements of Jesus before the high priest, Annas. Like other scenes in the passion narrative, this one centers the reader's attention on what Jesus himself says. The narrative *engagement* (the putting into play) of this whole structure is provided by vv. 12-13a and 24.28.

The ABA' structure, to which "rearrangement theories"⁽³⁷⁾ have been blind, stands out because of the repetition of the end of v. 18 at the beginning of v. 25, the very phrasing of the question in v. 17b (beginning of A) as reappearing in v. 25c (beginning of A'), and Peter's two concisely quoted denials (vv. 18a and 25c). Both of the first two questions, introduced by μή, can, as elsewhere in John and in other writers, expect a negative answer. Both, however, may in this context reflect the "μή of cautious assertions"⁽³⁸⁾. The Samaritan woman, for instance, who surely accepted Jesus as the Messiah, defensively phrased her conclusion as a cautious question (4,29: μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός;). In 4,29, however, the overtone seemed to be: "Isn't it too good to be true?" whereas in 18,17b, on the lips of the maid tending the door, it is rather: "Not another one?!" — a remark befitting an inconvenienced concierge. The second question, differing only in that it is posed by a group, and refers to Jesus less immediately (cp. αὐτοῦ, v. 25 with τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου, v. 17), may connote merely the cautious gambit in a conversation with one who is a stranger to a definable gathering (cp. v. 18). Neither of the first two questions exerts pressure on Peter. Even the third question, which expects an affirmative answer (οὐκ, v. 26), does not threaten personal assault, for all its personal thrust and impact. Nevertheless, Peter succumbs readily in every instance. No progressive emphasis can be discerned in his denials, as in Mark and Mat-

⁽³⁷⁾ For the variety, cf. SCHNACKENBURG, *Johannesevangelium*, III, 261.

⁽³⁸⁾ BARRETT, *Gospel According to John*, 526.

thew, nor the reverse, as in Luke. He does not take evasive action (as in Mark; Matt) but stands in one place, by the charcoal fire, with the slaves and servants (vv. 18.25). The Evangelist does not note at any point in the scene, particularly at its close, Peter's emotional reactions; he does not even suggest (as Luke does, 22,56) attention to Peter's face in firelight. John fastens his reader's attention solely on what Peter denies: that he, *too*, is a disciple, and that he was closely, *personally associated* with Jesus in the garden, the place where (as the reader has been told), Jesus gathered "often" with his disciples.

If there is a climax to John's account of Peter's denials, it occurs by reason of the escalation of interrogation. Nothing like the Marcan touch of "ganging-up" against Peter is perceptible. Rather, the escalation in John's story moves in the direction of "man-to-man" confrontation. Although Peter's third denial is not quoted, ἡρνῆσατο in v. 27 picks up ἡρνῆσατο of v. 25 (as, earlier, ἐκεῖνος of v. 25 picked up ἐκεῖνος of v. 17), and here his name figures as the subject of the sentence. Thus, Peter ultimately denies he was a personal associate of Jesus (the poignancy of which is brought out later, 21,15-17). Of equal concern to the Evangelist, however, is that Peter reaches this point even as he has denied that he, too, is a disciple; the gradation in the denials does not prevent their being a continuum.

In discerning the importance of the adverbial καί ("too") in the first two questions posed to Peter, Brown admits that, in the synoptic accounts of the accusation of Peter (Mark 14,67 pars.), there is no question of comparison with another disciple; rather, the "too" in the synoptic parallels implicitly refers to the disciples who were with Jesus when he was arrested⁽³⁹⁾. Brown infers: "Thus, in John as well the idea may be: 'Are you, *like those others* [emphasis mine], a disciple?'" Brown's inference seems vaguely inconsistent and ambiguous; it is certainly unwarranted. The emphasis in John falls heavily on *Peter himself*. For only John's account has drawn attention, and no little attention, to another *individual* disciple who is also present, arranges Peter's entry, and directly sets the stage for the opening question put to Peter and its repetition. This particular disciple does not merely "enable Peter to enter", but "leads Peter in-

(³⁹) BROWN, *Gospel of John* II, 284.

side". Such phraseology excludes physically distancing one from the other. Indeed, this other disciple has virtually no other function in the narrative but to lead Peter inside. His only special qualification is that he can enter because he is known, and is known well enough to gain entry for still another⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Although unnamed, the "other disciple" who speaks to the concierge and leads Peter inside is most probably the Beloved Disciple. Given the clarified references to "the other disciple" elsewhere in John (20,2-10) and his close personal association both with Jesus and with Peter (13,24-25; 21,10), it seems impossible to presume that John's reader is expected to assume that this one "who entered with Jesus" and "led Peter inside" was not a known, special disciple, the Beloved Disciple. Nevertheless, he remains unidentified in this text.

Schnackenburg, therefore, draws an opposite conclusion. He finds it inconceivable why the Evangelist would not actually speak here of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" *if* [emphasis his] that other disciple *were* indeed "the other disciple"⁽⁴¹⁾. He also draws attention to the further anonymity caused by the anarthrous ἄλλος μαθητής in v. 15.

Why this disciple is not here designated as "the disciple whom Jesus loved", even why he is initially introduced without the article, and why "another disciple" is even mentioned at all find a ready explanation in the focal point of Peter's denials, for which this "other disciple" sets the stage. This "other disciple" is not designated in terms of his personal identity or his distinctive relationship to Jesus, but in terms of his *function in the narrative*. In John's story, Peter is not necessarily in danger on the score of being a disciple of Jesus. John did not say that the disciples had fled. On the contrary, he implied that they were indeed protected by Jesus' actions and words before Jesus was led to Annas. The "other disciple" in this scene helps recall that situation; quite evidently, he himself faces no dangers, even though "he entered with Jesus" (18,15). Nothing in vv. 15-16 suggests that he endangers his associate by enabling him to

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Nothing in this text suggests this disciple's superiority or deference in relation to Peter. For a contrary view, cf. R. E. BROWN, K. P. DONFRIED, and John REUMANN, eds., *Peter in the New Testament* (New York 1973) 136.

⁽⁴¹⁾ SCHNACKENBURG, *Johannesevangelium*, III, 266.

enter the palace courtyard, much less that he tests him by leading him in. If anything, the contrary is true; *he facilitates his co-disciple's contact with Jesus*. What ensues is not his doing, but Peter's. His function in the narrative is to help set in relief, for the reader's benefit, the way in which Peter denies Jesus, namely, by denying that he, *too*, is a disciple.

Peter's personal denials may take on a certain typological cast in accordance with ecclesiological concerns of the Johannine community. For that community, denial of discipleship constitutes a personal denial of Jesus himself. Their bond with Jesus, who, of course, provides the reason for their unity and cohesion, finds expression in their bond with one another (cf. John 13,31-17,26). To deny the latter equivalently denies the former, and vice-versa.

The "representative role" of Peter has already been noted and so tagged by Daur⁽⁴²⁾. I prefer the adjective "typological", if only to preserve more clearly the personal specificity of Peter's predicted denials. What is said of Peter proves to be true "proportionately" of those who deny Jesus by denying that they, too, are disciples. In characteristically low-keyed Johannine style, the stark denials correspond quite closely with Jesus' prediction (13,38b): οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἕως οὗ ἀπαρνῆσῃ με τρίς). One may contrast the more vivid style of the Synoptic predictions and their corresponding fulfillment (Mark 14,30.66-72 and par.; Luke 22,34.57-62). What is more, the personal focus seems in John to be sharpened⁽⁴³⁾: "you / me", as also, in predicting the denials, Jesus adverted to Peter's attestation of ongoing personal devotion (John 13,37-38)⁽⁴⁴⁾. The fulfillment of the prediction is developed by John precisely as a denial of discipleship, which, apparently, is not the case in the Syn-

⁽⁴²⁾ DAUER, *Passionsgeschichte*, 315-316.

⁽⁴³⁾ This emerges largely through John's economy of detail. In Mark, the point is the immediacy ("today, this very night") and the *rapidity* of the denial (note the relative celerity: before X happens two times, Y will be done three times), Mark 14,30; 14,70 (μετὰ μικρόν) and 72. Matthew retains the element of immediacy (Matt 26,34). Luke highlights the denial of previous, personal knowledge (Luke 22,33.57) and association (22,59).

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Not quite, as in Luke, his protested *readiness for the journey* ahead (22,33), or, as in Mark and Matthew, his boastful self-assertion in relation to his co-disciples, which is focused on immunity from scandal, whether as an immunity which is personally unique (Mark 14,29, "... not I!") or permanent (Matt 26,33, "never").

optics, at least not prominently in Mark or in Matthew, and not noticeably in Luke.

If the denials are viewed in typological perspective in the Fourth Gospel, their placement framing Jesus' reply to Annas may more sensitively be appreciated. Jesus appeals to the testimony of those who heard what he said to them (v. 21). Certainly he is not calling directly for the testimony of Peter or of any of the disciples. For as yet they are not empowered to give it, since they require his departure and the sending of the Paraclete. Moreover, Jesus refers expressly to his public statements to the world (v. 20). Is it unlikely, however, that the reader is supposed to catch the irony of this situation? For instance, should he not reflect twice (as ironical statements are intended to make him do)⁽⁴⁵⁾, that those who were in the best position to hear what Jesus said and to testify to it were disciples? Should he not also, perhaps, as Grundmann has remarked⁽⁴⁶⁾, perceive irony in the way in which Peter's bald οὐκ εἶμι stands in contrast with Jesus' earlier self-declaration as he defends the disciples, an outstanding one of whom fails him even when he faces no real danger?

CONCLUSION

Johannine Christological and ecclesiological concerns can be detected as dictating in very large measure the composition of the Johannine passion narrative in these opening scenes. These episodes suggest that John perceives Jesus' passion as the moment of truth which builds upon and even gives further coherence to Jesus' previous contacts with adversaries and with disciples. John's passion narrative is by no means a portion of the Gospel loosely connected

(45) Perhaps a major reason for John's use of irony lies in his desire to provoke further, deeper reflection concerning what is really being done or said, so that his reader will really perceive, not superficially notice or blandly accept. To interpret ironical statements or situations, one must *look beyond yet through* such things. In this way, too, the interpretation of John's text seems to involve the reader's entering into the thought processes of its author and of Jesus himself as John presents him.

(46) W. GRUNDMANN, "Das Wort von Jesu Freunden (Joh. XV, 13-16) und das Herrenmahl", *NT* 3 (1959) 62-69, 65 n. 1.

with the course of Jesus' public ministry. Nor is it concerned with sectarian polemics. Study of its opening scenes helps point out how it heightens the Johannine challenge to personal, reflective understanding of Jesus through all that he did and said. If only by looking to the way in which John presents in both these scenes the relationship between Peter and Jesus, one can become aware of the Fourth Evangelist's concern with the issue of any disciple's personal understanding of Jesus and fidelity to him.

I have not tried to determine the precise circumstances that prompted John's final formulation of his tradition(s) concerning the passion. Suffice it to regard his community's interests as not being markedly polemical, but dominantly theological and pastoral, in line with the statement of purpose which closes the Gospel proper and is remarkably not delimited by the production-context of the work (since the audience it addresses still exists): "... that you may believe that Jesus is the messianic Son of God, and believing have life in his name" (20,31).

In the context of ongoing, story-form theology in Christian circles towards the end of the first century, the attempt better to understand Jesus and being disciples of Jesus may well have sought expression in freer, ever more independent narration and recasting of the narration. Considerable freedom in recasting a familiar story may even have served as a "conservative antidote" to forms of abstract speculation, if only by preserving concern for concrete inter-relationships among persons. The community's interests centered on key persons in its tradition, and it expressed its mind and concerns in the story it produced, or, much more exactly, in the story the Evangelist produced for it.

The exegete's main task is to read the story aright. Occasionally, he may need to remind himself that reconstructing sources and determining sociological circumstances of composition lie on a quite secondary level, although he must reckon with these enterprises in accounting for all the causes of the text. The foregoing reading of the two opening scenes of John's passion narrative may help put into sharper perspective the vital and fruitful concern for what the Fourth Evangelist wants to communicate by the way *he tells his own story* about Jesus.

Fordham University
New York City, NY 10458, U.S.A.

Charles Homer GIBLIN, S. J.

SOMMAIRE

L'exégète doit s'intéresser à la question des sources dans la mesure où elles font partie des causes du texte qu'il étudie. Mais c'est à la structure formelle du texte, son mouvement et son intention qu'il lui faut d'abord se consacrer.

Une étude narrative montre que la composition des deux scènes qui ouvrent le récit de la passion selon s. Jean a été dictée par des préoccupations christologiques et ecclésiologiques.

Pour Jean, la passion est le moment de vérité qui renforce et donne plus ample cohésion aux précédents contacts de Jésus avec ses adversaires et ses disciples. L'Évangéliste a probablement connu la (les) tradition(s) synoptique(s), mais il a en tout cas élaboré une composition qui lui est propre. En particulier, il a supprimé le procès devant Caïphe parce que, christologiquement, il n'allait pas dans le sens de l'ensemble de son récit. De même, il a mentionné «un autre disciple», qui est probablement le disciple bien-aimé mais dont l'identité n'importe pas dans le contexte, afin de mettre en relief la manière dont Pierre renie personnellement Jésus: en reniant sa propre identité de disciple.

ANIMADVERSIONES

«Je vais lui faire un allié qui soit son homologue»

(Gn 2,18)

A propos du terme 'ezer — «aide»

La phrase bien connue de Gn 2,18 n'offre sans doute guère de difficultés au traducteur. Son sens exact a cependant suscité quelques questions, en particulier en raison de l'intérêt récent pour la place que la Bible accorde à la femme⁽¹⁾. Nous relèverons d'abord quelques indices de la fluctuation des opinions à ce propos (I). Ensuite, pour pouvoir dirimer la question, nous pousserons l'examen dans deux directions différentes: quel est le sens du mot 'ezer (ou 'ēzer) qu'on traduit communément par «aide» (II)? et quelle est la solitude dont Dieu désire délivrer l'être humain en créant la femme (III)? Enfin, nous concluons (IV).

I

L'histoire de l'interprétation de Gn 2,18 n'est plus à faire. La plupart des commentaires en donnent un aperçu. On peut distinguer trois grandes tendances: la femme est créée en vue de la procréation⁽²⁾, pour assister l'homme dans son travail (l'entretien du jardin — Gn 2,5.15)⁽³⁾, ou enfin parce que l'homme n'est vraiment homme que dans la communion et la femme se révèle être le partenaire indispensable à cet effet⁽⁴⁾. Les traductions paraissent refléter des nuances analogues. Le mot 'ēzer est le plus souvent traduit par «aide»⁽⁵⁾. Mais l'anglais, par exemple, peut donner une touche plus personnelle à la phrase en utilisant le mot *helper* au lieu de *help*, beaucoup plus

(1) Pour plus de détails et une bonne bibliographie sur la question, cf. Marie DE MERODE, «“Une aide qui lui corresponde”. L'exégèse de Gen. 2,18-24 dans les récits de l'Ancien Testament, du judaïsme et du Nouveau Testament», *RTL* 8 (1977) 329-352.

(2) C'est déjà l'exégèse d'Ambroise et d'Augustin. Cf. M. DE MERODE, «Une aide», 329-330 et note 1.

(3) Cf. H. GUNKEL, *Genesis* (Göttingen 1969) 11: «Sein Leben ist zu einsam, seine Arbeit zu schwer» (entre autres).

(4) Cf. parmi d'autres C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis* (BK I,1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1983) 309.

(5) Cf. l'italien *aiuto* (Bibbia della CEI; E. TESTA, *Genesi* [Nuovissima versione dai testi originali; Roma 1983] 12); l'espagnol *ayuda* (BAC); l'allemand *Hilfe* (Einheitsübersetzung et C. Westermann); l'anglais *aid* (E. A. SPEISER, *Genesis* [Anchor Bible; Garden City, N.Y. 1964]); en français, DHORME (La Pléiade), BJ et TOB.

neutre (cf. *RSV*, J. Skinner). Et, toujours en anglais, les traductions les plus récentes préfèrent le terme *partner* (*NEB*, *NAB*). La traduction espagnole de L. Alonso Schökel témoigne elle aussi d'une certaine évolution des mentalités. L'édition de 1970 porte «alguien como él que le ayude»; celle de 1975 est assez différente: «el auxiliar que le corresponde». Le tour est plus personnel, la correspondance est mieux mise en relief, l'insistance porte moins sur l'aide que sur la réciprocité. Les traductions françaises essaient également de souligner ce dernier point en traduisant 'ēzer *kēnegdō* par «une aide qui lui soit semblable» (Dhorme, La Pléiade), «qui lui soit assortie» (*BJ*) ou «qui lui soit accordée» (*TOB*). Après ce bref tour d'horizon, la question du début se précise davantage: quelle est donc cette «aide» que Dieu fournit à l'homme? Est-elle de type personnel ou instrumental? La femme secondera-t-elle l'homme dans ses activités? Sera-t-elle un point d'appui nécessaire de son existence?

II

Un premier élément de réponse sera donné par le mot 'ēzer. Il n'est pas très usuel⁽⁶⁾. Les vingt et un emplois connus seront rapidement passés en revue; après quoi, nous analyserons d'autres termes de la même racine et quelques synonymes pour mieux cerner sa signification. En ce qui concerne le terme 'ēzer, l'enquête portera d'abord sur son sens général, puis sur les contextes où il apparaît.

Une première constatation s'impose à propos de 'ēzer: la majorité des textes, comme le notait déjà J. Skinner⁽⁷⁾, traite du secours divin. Il s'agit soit de l'aide qui vient de Dieu (Dt 33,26; Os 13,9; Ps 20,3; 89,20; 121,1.2; 124,8; Dn 11,34), soit d'une sorte de titre de Dieu lui-même (Ex 18,4; Dt 33,7.29; Ps 33,20; 70,6; 115,9.10.11; 146,5). Deux textes semblent faire exception (Is 30,5; Ez 12,14). Ils aideront à préciser le sens du mot. De la première série, c'est sans doute le Ps 124,8 qui est le texte le plus connu: «Notre secours est dans le nom du Seigneur, qui a fait le ciel et la terre» (cf. Ps 121,2). La *TOB* traduit: «Notre secours, c'est le nom du Seigneur, l'auteur des cieux et de la terre», en donnant peut-être à la préposition *bē* (*bēšēm*) la valeur d'un *beth essentiae* (cf. Joüon 133c). La seconde série contient aussi un texte connu: «Notre secours et notre bouclier, c'est lui (le Seigneur)» (Ps 33,20; cf. 115,9-11).

Les deux textes qui semblent faire exception (Is 30,5; Ez 12,14) aideront à nuancer la première constatation et montreront pourquoi le terme est si souvent attribué à Dieu. Is 30,5 l'emploie de façon négative, à l'adresse de ceux qui croient pouvoir trouver en Egypte un appui solide: «Tous seront couverts de confusion (selon le *Qéré*), à cause d'un peuple qui ne leur servira à rien, il ne leur sera d'aucun secours (*lō' lē'ēzer*) et ne pourra leur servir (*w'lo' l'hō'il*), il sera plutôt cause de leur confusion et même de leur infamie». Jérusalem s'est donc fourvoyée, selon Isaïe; elle va chercher du secours

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. M. DE MERODE, «Une aide», 332.

⁽⁷⁾ J. SKINNER, *Genesis* (ICC; Edinburgh 1930) 67, n. 18.

à la mauvaise adresse. Il n'est pas sans intérêt de noter que le terme parallèle à *lō' le' ezer* (*lō' le'hō'il*) s'applique souvent aux faux dieux (1 S 12,21; Is 57,12; Jr 2,8.11; 16,19) ou aux idoles (Is 44,9.10; Ha 2,18). Is 30,15 précisera la portée de l'oracle en disant où Jérusalem peut trouver le salut: dans la conversion et la confiance puisée aux sources de sa foi en YHWH. Ainsi, nous restons bien dans le contexte décrit plus haut: Dieu seul procure le «secours» attendu, non l'Égypte. Ez 12,14 est un peu plus difficile. Il prédit la défaite de Sédécias et sa fin violente. Le sens général est clair: «Et tous ceux qui l'entourent, sa garde (*'ezrōh*) et toutes ses troupes, je les disperserai à tous vents et l'épée, je la dégainerai derrière eux». Ici, il n'est guère possible de penser à Dieu. Il s'agit de ceux qui entourent le roi pour le protéger. Certes, le TM est corrigé par certains. Ils préfèrent lire *'ōzrāyw* («ses assistants»; cf. *BHS*) avec les versions (LXX, syriaque, targums). Mais la forme *'ezrōh* n'a rien d'étonnant (cf. Joüon 94h) et la signification du passage ne pose guère de problèmes: le terme désigne le groupe en qui Sédécias met sa confiance pour échapper au danger mortel qu'il court (le terme *s'bībōtāyw* qui le précède [«son entourage»] fournit toute la lumière nécessaire à l'interprétation). Il serait tentant d'éliminer ce texte. Mais la prudence inciterait plutôt à en tenir compte, parce qu'il est un des rares emplois du mot dans un texte en prose (cf. Dn 11,34 et peut-être Ex 18,4). Avec Is 30,5 et Dn 11,34, c'est aussi un des rares textes non cultuels. Il pourrait bien être le seul témoin explicite d'un usage profane et «prosaïque» que la Bible, pour des motifs évidents, n'a guère illustré. En fin de compte, le texte d'Ez 12,14 parle d'un secours humain qui se révèle insuffisant à sauver le roi de la mort. Peut-être avons-nous là un indice important en ce qui concerne le sens du terme *'ezer*. Il semble désigner un «secours» d'un type particulier, au point que la majorité des textes affirme que Dieu seul soit capable de le fournir. Et le texte d'Ez 12,14 nous met sans doute sur une piste importante lorsqu'il affirme que le roi Sédécias attendait de ce «secours» de lui permettre d'échapper à la mort.

Ce dernier point sera confirmé par l'étude des différents contextes où ce terme apparaît. Ils ont plus d'un trait commun: ce sont pour la plupart des textes poétiques; le secours apporté est toujours personnalisé; ils décrivent des situations où la vie est directement en danger; cette intervention secourable est indispensable pour échapper au danger.

1. Le mot appartient surtout au langage poétique. Font exception Ex 18,4 (proche d'une invocation liturgique); Ez 12,14 et Dn 11,34. Les psaumes l'emploient onze fois et toujours à propos de Dieu. Il semble donc être bien enraciné dans la langue liturgique (cf. les refrains des Ps 33,20; 115,9-11 ou Ps 121,2; 124,8).

2. Le secours est de type personnel et non matériel. Cela ressort particulièrement du fait que Dieu puisse être appelé «secours» (Ex 18,4; Ps 33,20; 115,9-11...). En outre, dans tous les textes en cause, il s'agit d'une aide apportée par une personne à une autre personne, ou par des personnes à d'autres personnes. L'intervention elle-même est de type personnel. Jamais il n'est question de richesses, par exemple, ni de vivres. Le point suivant est encore plus précis à ce sujet.

3. Les situations décrites sont des situations d'extrême danger. Il y est question d'ennemis (Ex 18,4; Dt 33,7; Ps 89,23-24), de guerre (Ps 20; 33,16-17; 89,23-24), de danger mortel (Ps 33,19-20; 70,3; 124). Le Ps 146,7-9 donne une liste des dangers dont Dieu sauve ses fidèles: oppression, faim, prison, cécité, humiliation (ou détresse), insécurité de l'étranger, de la veuve et de l'orphelin. C'est chaque fois l'existence comme telle qui est mise en péril.

4. Le secours est indispensable. Sans lui, on ne pourra pas échapper au danger (cf. Ps 121), ou bien il s'est révélé déterminant lorsqu'on a pu y échapper (cf. Ps 124). Dans quelques cas, il est affirmé clairement que Dieu seul est capable ou a été capable de sauver du péril en question (Ps 33; 121; 146; Is 30,5.15; Os 13,9).

En résumé, le secours décrit dans ces textes suppose toujours une intervention qui se déroule non loin de la frontière qui sépare la vie de la mort. Elle est indispensable pour ramener le fidèle dans le monde de la vie. On comprend dès lors que ce soit à peu près toujours Dieu qui entre en scène.

Un coup d'œil jeté sur les synonymes du mot *'ēzer* apportera quelques compléments d'information. Le mot *'ezrā*, tout d'abord, est très proche de *'ēzer*. Ps 40,18 et 70,6 montrent même qu'ils sont à peu près équivalents. Il est souvent utilisé à propos de Dieu (Ps 27,9; 35,2; 40,18; 44,27; 46,2; 63,8) ou du secours qui vient de Dieu (Ps 22,20; 38,23; 40,14; 60,13=108,13; 70,2; 71,12; 94,17). On a remarqué que le Ps 70 utilise *'ezrā* au v. 2 et *'ēzer* au v. 6, là où le Ps 40,18 emploie *'ezrā*. Les situations décrites sont aussi extrêmement périlleuses: maladies graves et ennemis (Ps 27,9.11-12; 35,1-4; 38), guerre (Ps 60 et 108), tragédie nationale (Ps 46). Mais là où *'ezrā* diffère de *'ēzer*, c'est lorsqu'il décrit un secours militaire important (cf. cependant Ez 12,14; Jg 5,23; Is 10,3; 20,6; 31,1.2; Jr 37,7; Na 3,9; Lam 4,17; 2 Ch 28,21. Quant à Jb 6,13; 31,21, ils parlent de façon plus générale; Jb 31,21 se situe nettement dans un contexte juridique. Ainsi, on peut dire en conclusion que le terme *'ēzer* a une portée théologique plus grande que *'ezrā*, qui est moins souvent utilisé en relation avec Dieu.

Un autre synonyme pourrait être le participe *qal* du verbe *'zr* (*'ōzēr*). Les psaumes l'emploient souvent à propos de Dieu (Ps 10,14; 22,12; 30,11; 54,6; 118,7; cf. 1 Ch 12,19). Mais on le rencontre aussi dans des passages d'allure plus générale (Ps 107,12; Jb 29,12; 30,13; Lam 1,7; Dn 11,45) et il désigne très souvent l'allié dans des contextes militaires (1 R 20,16; 2 R 14,26; Is 31,3; 63,5; Jr 47,4; Ez 30,8; 32,21; Jb 9,13; 1 Ch 12,1). L'expression *'ēn 'ōzēr* *l'* est fréquente (2 R 14,26; Ps 72,12; Jb 29,12; Lam 1,7; Dn 11,45; sans *l'*: Is 63,5; Ps 22,12; 107,12). Comme pour *'ēzer* et *'ezrā*, le «secours» intervient dans des circonstances où la vie est sérieusement menacée. Mais *'ōzēr* reste plus général et il est surtout moins souvent employé à propos de Dieu. Son usage se révèle moins exclusif que celui de *'ēzer*.

En dehors des substantifs ou du verbe de la racine *'zr*, on trouve au moins deux synonymes importants de *'ēzer*: *māgēn* («bouclier»: Ps 33,20; 115,9-11) et *m'pallēṭ* («libérateur»: Ps 70,6; cf. 40,18). Ces deux termes sont très souvent réservés à Dieu, tout comme *'ēzer*. Ainsi, *māgēn* n'est employé que deux fois de façon métaphorique à propos du roi (Ps 84,10; 89,19) contre une vingtaine de fois à propos de Dieu (Gn 15,1; Dt 33,29; 2 S

22,3.31.36; Ps 3,4; 7,11; 18,3.31.36; 28,7; 33,20; 84,12; 115,9.10.11; 119,114; 144,2; Pr 2,7; 30,5). Quant au titre *mēpalî* ou *mēpallî* («mon libérateur»), il n'est décerné qu'à Dieu seul (Ps 18,3.49; 40,18=70,6; avec *lî*: 2 S 22,2; Ps 144,2 [avec, de plus, *māgēn*]). La racine *pl* au *piel* a d'ailleurs le plus souvent Dieu pour sujet (2 S 22,44=Ps 18,44; Ps 17,13; 22,5.9; 31,2; 37,40; 43,1; 71,2.4; 91,14; autres dieux: Ps 82,4; hommes: Mi 6,14; Jb 23,7).

En dernier lieu, il conviendrait de comparer 'ēzer aux termes qui dérivent de la racine *yš'* («aider», «sauver»). Des travaux récents sur cette racine, il ressort: 1) qu'elle couvre un champ beaucoup plus vaste que 'zr (par exemple, le domaine juridique); 2) qu'on la trouve autant en prose qu'en poésie, contrairement à 'ēzer, 'ezrā et 'ōzēr; 3) qu'elle décrit plutôt l'action salvifique dans son ensemble, alors que 'zr concerne davantage l'intervention particulière; 4) l'usage de *yš'* est moins exclusivement théologique, en partie parce que la racine est employée très fréquemment⁽⁸⁾.

En conclusion, il apparaît que le mot 'ēzer est, de tous ceux qui ont été passés en revue, le moins utilisé et celui qui est davantage mis en relation avec Dieu seul. On ne s'étonnera donc pas de le retrouver dans de nombreux noms propres, la plupart théophores (cf. 'ābî' ezer, 'ahî' ezer, 'ēlî' ezer, 'î' ezer, hādād' ezer, yō' ezer — KB²).

III

Arrivé à ce stade, il nous faut poser une question: quel danger menace l'homme en Gn 2,18, s'il est vrai que 'ēzer désigne toujours une aide qui permet d'échapper à de grands dangers menaçant l'existence au point que Dieu seul, en général, soit capable d'en délivrer? Le texte ne nous donne qu'une seule réponse: il s'agit de la solitude. «Il n'est pas bon que l'homme soit seul» — *lō' -tōb hēyōt hā'ādām 'ebaddō* (2,18a).

Quelques textes insistent sur le péril de la solitude. Il s'agit bien souvent de la mort. Ainsi en va-t-il d'un peuple isolé (Mi 7,14; Is 27,10; Lam 1,1). Un homme seul peut être attaqué, comme Jacob en Gn 32,25; Ahitofel conseille d'isoler David pour le frapper plus facilement (2 S 17,2). L'isolement du prophète lui fait craindre pour sa vie (Élie: 1 R 18,22; 19,10.14) ou bien il est la cause de sa profonde détresse (Jr 15,17; cf. Ps 102,8). Cet isolement est le lot d'une personne en deuil (Lam 3,28) ou celui du lépreux (Lv 13,46), l'excommunié au sens littéral du terme. C'est enfin la situation de la veuve sans enfants (Is 49,21; cf. Lam 1,1). L'homme seul est semblable au désert (*midbār* — Is 27,10) ou aux oiseaux qui hantent le désert, les champs de ruines et qui sont seuls sur un toit (Ps 102,7-8)⁽⁹⁾. Le célibat de Jérémie (Jr 16,1-4) et le veuvage d'Ezéchiél (Ez 24,15-27) sont des signes de la fin de Jérusalem. Être seul, dans tous ces passages, cela signifie être rejeté comme une épave, loin du fleuve de la vie. Celle-ci est au contraire communion et

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. U. BERGMANN, «'zr, helfen», *THAT* II, 259; F. STOLZ, «jš' hi., helfen», *THAT* I, 787-790; J. F. SAWYER, «jš'», *TWAT* III, 1044-1059.

⁽⁹⁾ Sur ce point, cf. H.-J. ZOBEL, «bādād», *TWAT* I, 511-518, qui ne parle malheureusement pas de Gn 2,18.

partage, l'écoulement et bénédiction. Sans insister sur l'aspect de procréation, le texte de Gn 2,18, au vu de ce qui précède, devrait l'impliquer. Engendrer, c'est en effet participer à la générosité divine, être plongé dans le grand courant de la surabondance de la vie (cf. Ps 128 et les bénédictions patriarcales). La stérilité, comme la solitude, est une malédiction (Dt 28,18; 1 S 1,6) dont Dieu seul peut délivrer (Gn 30,1-2). La vie n'est vraiment ce qu'elle est qu'au moment où on peut la partager et la transmettre. C'est pourquoi la solitude est si souvent comparée au désert stérile.

IV

Cette brève enquête devrait permettre de mieux comprendre le sens de Gn 2,18. Étant l'*'ezer* de l'homme, le femme devrait pouvoir lui fournir cet appui personnel et cette aide indispensable dont il a besoin dans son combat pour l'existence. Le contexte confirme-t-il cette vue?

C'est probablement à ce stade que l'expression *k'negdô* ajoute une nuance non négligeable. Pour être à même de fournir à l'homme le soutien nécessaire, la femme doit être, si l'on peut dire, «à la hauteur» de son partenaire. C'est bien ce que suggère la narration, semble-t-il. Les animaux, par exemple, sont reconnus incapables d'assumer ce rôle (2,20). Si la femme remplit les conditions nécessaires, c'est parce que, au contraire de toutes les autres créatures, elle est tirée de l'homme et non du sol (*min-hā'ādām* – 2,22 – et non *min-hā'ādāmā* – 2,7.9.19). Elle est bien de la même «étouffe» que l'homme (2,21.23: «os de mes os, chair de ma chair» et le jeu de mots *'iš* et *'iššā*). Elle seule peut délivrer l'homme de la solitude, puisqu'il peut s'attacher à elle et former avec elle «une seule chair» (2,24)⁽¹⁰⁾. C'est parce que la femme est *k'negdô* que l'homme n'est plus *l'baddô*, pour autant que ce qui précède ne soit pas erroné. Ainsi, la femme peut être pour l'homme l'*'ezer*, parce qu'elle est une personne du même «genre» que lui. C'est ce que soulignent deux textes du Siracide, qui résument assez bien ce que ces lignes ont voulu expliquer. Le premier (Si 36,29) est un commentaire de Gn 2,18-24: «Qui acquiert une femme fait la plus belle acquisition: elle est une alliée, une forte-ress et une colonne d'appui» — selon l'hébreu: *qnh 'sh r' šyt qny n' zr wmbšr mš' n*. Le second insiste sur la parenté comme condition d'une véritable relation: «Toute chair aime son espèce et tout homme qui lui est semblable; chaque espèce se regroupe (litt.: «l'espèce de toute chair à côté d'elle-même») et c'est à ceux de son espèce que l'homme s'associe» — selon l'hébreu: *kl habšr y' hb mynw / wkl 'dm 't hdmh lw / myn kl bšr 'šlw / w' l mynw yhbr 'dm* (Si 13,15-16)⁽¹¹⁾.

Institut Biblique Pontifical
Via della Pilotta 25
I-00187 Roma

Jean-Louis SKA

⁽¹⁰⁾ Sur le sens exact de l'expression, cf. M. GILBERT, «Une seule chair» (Gn 2,24), *NRT* 100 (1979) 66-89.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. A. PETERS, *Ecclesiasticus* (Freiburg/Breisgau 1905) 81 et 43.

I misteri di Gen 12,8 nell'interpretazione di Ambrogio (Abr. 2,3,11)

È noto che il secondo libro del *De Abraham* si distingue non solo dal primo⁽¹⁾, ma anche dal resto della produzione esegetica di Ambrogio per un più intenso ed elaborato ricorso all'allegoria che ne rende la lettura alquanto faticosa⁽²⁾. Anche per questo motivo *Abr.* 2 ha avuto minore fortuna ed una tradizione manoscritta più povera⁽³⁾ che ci ha conservato il testo con qualche lacuna e diversi punti oscuri.

Fra i luoghi che l'edizione critica di K. Schenkl non è riuscita a chiarire, ve n'è uno che ha già attirato l'attenzione del noto filologo e biblista A. Vaccari⁽⁴⁾. Si tratta di *Abr.* 2,3,11 (CSEL 32,1, p. 573, 2 ss.): *iam illa quis non miretur mysteria, quod Bethlem*⁽⁵⁾ *iuxta mare † aggee ab oriente*⁽⁶⁾. *Etenim*

(1) Nel primo libro l'interpretazione dominante è quella morale.

(2) La spiegazione di questa caratteristica va ricercata nel modello, che Ambrogio ha seguito sistematicamente, anche se non pedissequamente: le *Quaestiones in Genesim* di Filone d'Alessandria, conservate in parte in una versione armena, edita e tradotta in latino da J. B. AUCHER, *Philonis Judaei paralipomena armena, libri videlicet quattuor in Genesim, libri duo in Exodum*, etc. (Venetiis 1826).

(3) Dall'esame dell'apparato critico, ampio e minuzioso, di K. SCHENKL (CSEL 32, 1, pp. 501 ss.) risulta che l'unico testimone valido per la costituzione del testo di *Abr.* 2 è P (*Parisinus lat. 12137, olim Corbeiensis*, sec. IX); gli altri sette manoscritti sono da questo direttamente o indirettamente derivati. Che *Abr.* 2 sia di non facile lettura è già stato più volte sottolineato: J.-R. PALANQUE, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire romain* (Paris 1933) 44, lo definisce una «dissertation particulièrement abstruse».

(4) A. VACCARI, "Locus Ambrosii De Abrahamo 2,11 emendatus", *Bib* 3 (1922) 449-450.

(5) Preferisco la grafia *Bethlem* di P, mentre lo Schenkl scrive *Bethleem*. In realtà questo passo, come vedremo, si riferisce a Gen 12,8, dove non si parla di *Bethlem*, ma di *Bethel*. Secondo H. LEWY, "Neue Philontexte in der Überarbeitung des Ambrosius", in *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-historische Klasse* (Berlin 1932) 39, n. 9, Ambrogio avrebbe consapevolmente, «pia fraude», operato lo scambio dei nomi (evidentemente perché *Bethlem* offriva più facile appoggio alla sua esegesi allegorica e mistica). Come ricorda il Vaccari ("Locus Ambrosii...", 450), sono diversi i luoghi delle opere di Ambrogio che si riferiscono a passi biblici ove inequivocabilmente si nomina la città cananea di *Bethel*, ma che il nostro Autore identifica con la città natale di Gesù. Stando ai dati della tradizione manoscritta — ma sulla loro attendibilità bisogna essere cauti, essendo le due parole pressoché omografe — in questi stessi luoghi troviamo attestato ora *Bethel* ora *Bethlem*: oltre al passo qui discusso, si vedano anche la prima parte del medesimo paragrafo 11 (CSEL 32,1, p. 572, 12 ss.); *Abr.* 1,2,5-6 (CSEL 32,1, p. 505,16-20: due volte ricorre la parola *Bethel*,

uel anima, quae meretur templum dei appellari, uel ecclesia tunditur saecularium curarum fluctibus, sed non subruitur, caeditur, sed non labefactatur, commotiones fluctuum et insurrectiones passionum corporalium facili premere ac mitigare. Spectat aliorum naufragia ipsa immunis et exsors periculi, parata semper ut inlucescat sibi Christus atque eius inluminatio iocunditatem adquirat sibi. Sicut enim oculi pascuntur primo diei lumine, ita etiam mens nostra inuentis alitur sapientiae et quibusdam eius radiis uidetur splendescente... Oggetto della discussione è la frase che lo Schenkl segna con la 'crux', a proposito della quale scrive in apparato: «quid lateat non exploro». Il Vaccari ha ritenuto di poterla sanare. La sua riflessione parte dalla giusta constatazione che l'espressione è una citazione — non rilevata dallo Schenkl — di Gen 12,8 (precisamente della parte centrale del versetto), che lo studioso pone subito a confronto con il corrispondente versetto dei Settanta: καὶ ἔστησεν ἐκεῖ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ, ἐν⁽⁷⁾ Βαιθὴλ κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ Ἀγγαὶ κατὰ ἀνατολάς e anche con quello della *Vetus Latina* attestato in due luoghi da Fulg. Rusp., *Fab.* 31 e 34 (CCL 91A, p. 826, 19 s. e p. 837, 29 s.): *et statuit ibi tabernaculum suum Bethel, secundum mare Agge, contra orientem*⁽⁸⁾. Basandosi su tale raffronto il Vaccari conclude: «Ambrosius certe... scripsit: *Bethel iuxta mare et Aggae ab oriente*, vel ad summum, mutato *et in est*, sive

ma nel primo caso è assai probabile che si debba leggere *Bethlem* con i codici P e T); *Iac.* 2,7,32 (CSEL 32,2, p. 50, 22 ss.); *Exp. ps.* 118 6,12 (CSEL 62, p. 114, 8 s.). È più verosimile, perciò, che Ambrogio abbia inconsapevolmente supposto l'esistenza di una sola località indifferentemente denominata *Bethel* o *Bethlem*. Così si può spiegare che l'uno e l'altro nome, riferiti alla medesima località, si alternino, a volte, a distanza di poche linee. Alla confusione dei nomi si accompagna quella dei loro significati: mentre in *Iac.* e in *Exp. ps.* 118 a *Bethel/Bethlem* è attribuito il significato proprio di *Bethlem* (*domus panis*), nei passi del *De Abraham* l'interpretazione è quella di *Bethel* (*domus dei*), a motivo della stretta dipendenza da Filone. La confusione fra le due località ricorre anche in Isid., in *Gen.* 24,1 (PL 83, 258A).

(6) Lo Schenkl pone qui un punto fermo, ma pare evidente che l'espressione è interrogativa.

(7) Il Vaccari cita dall'edizione di BROOKE-MCLEAN (Cambridge 1906-1917), avvertendo che alcuni codici omettono ἐν, ma nell'edizione di J. W. WEVERS, *Septuaginta*, I. *Genesis* (Göttingen 1974), ἐν non è accolto. Senza entrare nel merito della questione, mi limito ad osservare che le testimonianze della *Vetus Latina*, più oltre citate, presuppongono l'assenza di ἐν; le attestazioni di Fulgenzio di Ruspe sono chiare, e ancor più esplicitamente Ambrogio esclude che *Bethlem* sia un locativo, avendo egli in precedenza, nel medesimo paragrafo 11, precisato che questo termine deve essere inteso come denominazione di *tabernaculum* (*tabernaculum ipsum Bethlem appellauit*).

(8) Nella prima attestazione di Fulgenzio è omessa la frase *et statuit ibi tabernaculum suum Bethel*, ma il Vaccari ("Locus Ambrosii...", 450, n. 2), che cita Fulgenzio dall'edizione di PL 65, acutamente osserva che l'espressione deve essere reintegrata, perché accidentalmente caduta per l'omeoteleuton con la precedente parola *Bethel*. Non ha tenuto conto di questa osservazione B. FISCHER (*Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*, 2. *Genesis* [Freiburg 1951-1954] 155, app. ad Gen 12,8), che pure cita l'articolo del Vaccari per il passo di Ambrogio, e — più sorprendentemente — nemmeno J. Fraipont, che ha curato l'edizione critica delle opere di Fulgenzio nel CCL 91-91A (Turnhout 1968), ha notato l'omissione.

omisso *et* (cum Fulgentio) et adiecto *est*⁽⁹⁾ contextus gratia, *Bethel iuxta mare aggae* (sic!) *est ab oriente*». La prima soluzione è fondata sul testo dei Settanta, la seconda tiene conto della mancanza di *et* in Fulgenzio, ma presenta l'aggiunta di *est*. Bisogna riconoscere che il Vaccari, individuando nell'oscura espressione di Ambrogio una citazione di Gen 12,8, ha dato un valido contributo per fare luce sul passo, ma nell'indicare la prima ipotesi di emendamento egli si è lasciato più influenzare dalla versione dei Settanta che guidare dal testo di Fulgenzio, che acquista particolare valore se si considera che per la *Vetus Latina* Fulgenzio è l'unico testimone — oltre Ambrogio si intende — del luogo biblico in questione⁽¹⁰⁾. Ma prima di concludere che Ambrogio e Fulgenzio hanno utilizzato una versione latina pregeronimiana ove era omesso *et*, è logico chiedersi se Ambrogio non abbia, invece, attinto e tradotto personalmente la citazione biblica dal testo greco che usava come fonte, cioè dalle *Quaestiones in Genesim* di Filone d'Alessandria. Purtroppo le *quaestiones* relative a Gen 10,10–15,6 (e quindi anche quella eventuale su Gen 12,8) sono perdute⁽¹¹⁾ e in nessun altro luogo di Filone troviamo citato Gen 12,8⁽¹²⁾. D'altra parte, secondo l'apparato critico dell'edizione della Genesi greca di J. W. Wevers, l'omissione di καὶ davanti a Ἀγγαί non risulta documentata. È molto improbabile, dunque, che l'accordo Ambrogio–Fulgenzio nell'omettere *et* sia puramente casuale, e, comunque, per tentare di risolvere il problema testuale di Abr. 2,3,11 dovremo fare più attenzione a tale concordanza⁽¹³⁾ che al testo greco di Gen 12,8. Un'altra considerazione si

(9) L'integrazione di *est* si fonda probabilmente anche su un intervento, per altro non attendibile, di P², che corregge *Aggee* in *Galileae est*, che è la lezione accolta dai Maurini (cf. PL 14, 483D).

(10) Circa il tipo di *Vetus Latina* seguito da Ambrogio per la Genesi, cf. B. FISCHER, *Vetus Latina*, 2..., 18* e H. J. FREDE, "Probleme des ambrosianischen Bibeltextes", in *Ambrosius Episcopus*. Atti del congresso internazionale... (Milano 1976) 381.

(11) Oggi la tesi, secondo cui Ambrogio disponeva del testo integrale in lingua greca delle *Quaestiones in Genesim*, può contare su solidi argomenti. E. LUCCHESI, *L'usage de Philon dans l'œuvre exégétique de saint Ambroise* (Leiden 1977) 42–46, ha elencato una serie di ragioni per dimostrare che la lacuna delle *Quaestiones* relativa a Gen 10,10–15,6 (della quale non vi è indizio nella versione armena) non è dovuta a Filone e che Ambrogio, disponendo di un manoscritto che risaliva ad una tradizione migliore rispetto a quella da cui dipende il testo armeno, ha potuto utilizzare le *quaestiones* perdute.

(12) Si veda il Supplemento di *Biblia Patristica* (Paris 1982) dedicato a Filone.

(13) È vero che fra le due testimonianze vi sono delle discrepanze, ma una loro attenta valutazione consente, credo, di escludere che esse abbiano valore separativo; di *Bethlem/Bethel* si è trattato in nota 5; le varianti *iuxta* (Ambr.), *secundum* (Fulg.) non sono rilevanti e riproducono entrambe fedelmente κατά; notevole parrebbe la terza differenza, in quanto, mentre *contra orientem* (Fulg.) risale ai Settanta, *ab oriente* (Ambr.) corrisponde al testo ebraico, ed anche la Vulgata, che discende dall'ebraico, ha *ab oriente*. Questa coincidenza fa sorgere il sospetto che la lezione *ab oriente* in Ambrogio non dipenda da una diversa tradizione, ma sia l'esito di una successiva contaminazione con la Vulgata. Per sostenere questa ipotesi, che se potesse essere dimostrata, renderebbe assai più probante l'accordo Ambr.–Fulg., abbiamo un sia pur tenue indizio paleografico: dall'apparato critico dello Schenkl risulta che in Ambrogio la lezione di P è

oppone alla prima ipotesi del Vaccari: l'aggiunta di *et* restituirebbe all'espressione biblica il senso autentico (quello inteso da Gerolamo nella Vulgata): «e lì pose la sua tenda, avendo Bethlem verso il mare (=a occidente) e Agge (=Ai) a oriente». Ma il commento allegorico di Ambrogio parrebbe supporre nella frase in discussione una netta distinzione in due membri, che non solo non è necessario unire con una congiunzione, ma che l'interpretazione allegorica vuole contrapposti: *Bethlem iuxta mare, Aggae ab oriente*. Cerchiamo innanzi tutto di rintracciare nel commento ambrosiano la connessione con ogni elemento di questo testo biblico: *anima* e *ecclesia* sono l'interpretazione di *Bethlem*; nei *fluctus* e nelle *insurrectiones passionum*, che scuotono l'anima e la chiesa, troviamo l'allegoria del mare. Più difficile è stabilire come Ambrogio abbia interpretato il termine *Aggae*. Gli antichi esegeti lo intendevano solitamente come ἑορτή: così Origene⁽¹⁴⁾ e Didimo il Cieco⁽¹⁵⁾, il cui commento a Gen 12,8⁽¹⁶⁾ è assai vicino a quello di Ambrogio. Il medesimo significato etimologico è documentato da F. Wutz⁽¹⁷⁾. In effetti il commento di Ambrogio ha delle espressioni che possono ricollegarsi a questa interpretazione: *parata semper... iocunditatem adquirat sibi, pascuntur... alitur... uideatur splendescere*. Ma lo stesso Wutz⁽¹⁸⁾ e P. Lagarde⁽¹⁹⁾ danno attestata l'interpretazione ἀνάπαυσις nel gruppo vaticano degli *onomastica*, le cui etimologie Ambrogio dimostra più volte di conoscere⁽²⁰⁾: ad ἀνάπαυσις sembrano alludere le parole *non subruitur, non labefactatur, facilis premere ac mitigare... ipsa immunis et exsors periculi*. Infine, è facile comprendere che con *ab oriente* vanno connesse le espressioni *ut inlucescat sibi Christus, eius inluminatio, primo diei lumine, eius radiis*. In modo schematico, riassumerei così il pensiero di Ambrogio⁽²¹⁾: la chiesa e l'anima sono scosse dai moti del

ab orientem (m exp. m2); si può dunque pensare ad una lezione originaria *contra orientem* anche in Ambrogio? O, forse, la lezione di Ambrogio era *ad orientem*, graficamente molto simile alla lezione di P e sostanzialmente equivalente a quella di Fulgenzio? Purtroppo il commento di Ambrogio non ci aiuta a dare una risposta precisa a questi interrogativi; a meno che non si voglia vedere nell'espressione *parata semper ut inlucescat sibi Christus* un labile sostegno a favore di *contra* (o *ad*).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Orig., in *Io.* 20, 11 (PG 14, 593C).

⁽¹⁵⁾ Didym., in *Gen.* 223,4 s. (SC 244, p. 172).

⁽¹⁶⁾ *Ibid.*, 219 ss. (p. 164 ss.).

⁽¹⁷⁾ F. WUTZ, *Onomastica sacra*, I (TU 41; Leipzig 1914) 382.

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Ibid.*, 131 e 132.

⁽¹⁹⁾ P. LAGARDE, *Onomastica sacra* (Göttingen 1887 [=Hildesheim 1966]) 182,9.

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. WUTZ, *Onomastica* I, 101.

⁽²¹⁾ Giova, credo, ad una maggior chiarezza la traduzione integrale del passo esaminato, precisando che intendo *quod* (davanti a *Bethlem*) come una dichiarativa che introduce una citazione (=ὅτι con il discorso diretto): «E poi chi non si stupirà dei misteri (=dei significati reconditi, mistici) del testo sacro: *Bethlem vicino al mare, Agge a oriente*? Infatti l'anima, che giustamente è chiamata tempio di Dio, o anche la chiesa, è battuta dai flutti delle preoccupazioni mondane, ma non è travolta; è colpita, ma non cade; facilmente contiene e modera gli scuotimenti e gli assalti delle passioni del corpo. Osserva i naufragi altrui, mentre lei è immune e esente da pericolo, sempre pronta per essere illuminata da Cristo e per ricevere con la sua luce la gioia. Infatti, come gli occhi si nutrono della

mondo e dalle passioni del corpo (*Bethlem iuxta mare*), ma Cristo assicura loro tranquillità e gioia (*Aggae ab oriente*). L'antitesi fra questi due 'commata' in asindeto di Gen 12,8 è evidenziata nel commento dalla ripetizione di *sed non*. Tale interpretazione presuppone non solo il nesso fra *tabernaculum* e *Bethlem*, che lo stesso Ambrogio poco sopra, nel medesimo paragrafo, esplicitamente afferma (*tabernaculum ipsum Bethlem appellauit*), ma anche una imprecisata connessione fra *tabernaculum* e *Aggae*, che deduciamo dal contesto. Per questi motivi, dunque, non mi pare convincente la ricostruzione *Bethlem iuxta mare et Aggae ab oriente*⁽²²⁾.

Nella seconda ipotesi il Vaccari propone, come si è detto, di integrare *est* (*Bethlem iuxta mare Aggae est ab oriente*); ma, alla luce dell'analisi appena esposta, tale emendamento appare insostenibile. Anche interpretando diversamente il luogo biblico, non si vede la necessità di aggiungere *est*, che eventualmente si può sottintendere. Del resto — è bene ripeterlo — la lezione senza integrazione alcuna trova sostegno nelle testimonianze di Fulgenzio.

In conclusione: a parte il sospetto di contaminazione dalla Vulgata sulla lezione *ab oriente*⁽²³⁾, il luogo di *Abr.* 2,3,11, che lo Schenkl giudica 'desperatus' e che il Vaccari ha voluto emendare, è da considerare non corrotto: la caduta di *et* era già avvenuta nel testo biblico latino utilizzato da Ambrogio e Fulgenzio⁽²⁴⁾. Quest'ultimo non ci rivela come abbia inteso il versetto, ma se ritocchiamo l'enigmatica punteggiatura di J. Fraipont nel CCL 91A — la stessa delle vecchie edizioni, compresa la PL 65 —, avremmo un asindeto nel quale è possibile ritrovare il significato originario: *et statuit ibi tabernaculum suum, Bethel secundum mare, Agge contra orientem*. Ambrogio ne ha dato un'interpretazione non del tutto riconducibile al senso letterale autentico, in armonia però con il tenore della sua esegesi*.

Università di Urbino
61029 Urbino

Franco GORI

prima luce del giorno, così anche la nostra mente si alimenta delle scoperte della sapienza e in certo qual modo sembra risplendere dei suoi raggi».

(²²) Anche H. LEWY, *Neue Philontexte*, 39, n. 15, che mostra di non aver conosciuto l'articolo del Vaccari, suggerisce sulla base della versione greca, di leggere nel passo di *Abr.* 2,3,11 *et Aggae*; ma egli fonda anche il suo giudizio su una lezione (*est Aggae*), che attribuisce ai codici, e che sembra, invece, frutto di un fraintendimento dell'apparato dello Schenkl.

(²³) Vedi sopra, n. 13.

(²⁴) Non si può escludere che l'omissione di *et* sia originaria, che cioè chi ha tradotto dal greco abbia volutamente trascurato καί, preferendo l'asindeto, ma l'ipotesi mi sembra improbabile, dato che il traduttore tende abitualmente a ricalcare il testo dei Settanta.

* Ringrazio J. Gribomont, che con precisi e preziosi suggerimenti mi è stato di aiuto nella stesura di questa nota; sono anche grato a H. J. Frede e a M. Simonetti per avermi comunicato il loro autorevole giudizio sulla tesi qui sostenuta.

Die Redewendung דבר על-לב im AT — Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis von Jes 40,2

1. Das Problem⁽¹⁾

Nach dem neuesten theologischen Wörterbuch kommt die Wendung 'auf, zum Herzen reden' aus der Liebessprache: 'דבר על-לב' ... ist speziell in der Liebessprache zu Hause, in der die Wendung das Verhältnis des Mannes zur Frau charakterisiert⁽²⁾. Da es im gleichen Beitrag später heißt: 'Ho 2,16 und DtJes 40,2 übertragen den Ausdruck auf das Verhältnis Gottes zu seinem Volk'⁽³⁾, müßte man unsere Stelle gewissermaßen als Liebeserklärung Jahwes an sein Volk, an Jerusalem verstehen.

Gegen eine solche Deutung haben bereits zwei Autoren Verdacht geschöpft. Es sind dies J. Vollmer, der schreibt: 'Ob man die Wendung דבר על-לב auf den Bereich der Liebessprache einengen darf, so H. W. Wolff, Hosea, 51, und W. Rudolph, Hosea, 75, ist nicht sicher'⁽⁴⁾ und H.-W. Jüngling: 'Wahrscheinlich ist es zuviel behauptet, daß die Wendung "zu Herzen reden" "hauptsächlich zur Liebessprache" gehöre'⁽⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Die vorliegende Arbeit entstand ursprünglich, in einer noch etwas anderen Form anlässlich eines Seminars von H. Simian-Yofre zu DtJes im Wintersemester 1982/83 am PIB in Rom. Ihm, und besonders auch meinem verstorbenen Mitbruder D. Mc Carthy, der noch in der letzten Zeit seines Aufenthaltes am Institut diese Arbeit mit seiner gewohnten Sorgfalt durchsah, danke ich für die Ermutigung zur Publikation und für viele wertvolle Hinweise. Danken möchte ich auch N. Lohfink für weitere wesentliche Hilfe bei der Erstellung dieser Fassung.

⁽²⁾ W. H. SCHMIDT, דבר, *TWAT* II, 105. Ähnlich auch H. W. WOLFF, *Anthropologie des AT* (München 1973) 86, der von der Wendung sagt: 'Sie gehört hauptsächlich zur Liebessprache'. Der älteste mir bekannte Beleg einer solchen Deutung ist bei A. WEISER, *Das Buch der 12 Kleinen Propheten* I (ATD 24; Göttingen 1949) 30, zu finden. Weiters befürworten diese Deutung: H. W. WOLFF, in seinem Kommentar *Dodekapropheton I: Hosea* (BKAT 14/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1961; 1965) 51; W. RUDOLPH, *Hosea* (KAT 13/1; Gütersloh 1966) 75; L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL u. J. SICRE DIAZ, *Profetas* II (Madrid 1980) 878; F. ANDERSEN u. D. N. FREEDMAN, *Hosea* (AB 24; Garden City, N.Y.) 272. Alle diese Autoren verstehen den Ausdruck in Hos 2,16 als 'Liebessprache'. Andersen und Freedman rechnen auch die Belege in Gen 34,3, Rut 2,13, Jes 40,2 dazu, Schmidt und Alonso Schökel/ Sicre Diaz darüber hinaus noch Ri 19,3.

⁽³⁾ *TWAT* II, 105.

⁽⁴⁾ J. VOLLMER, *Geschichtliche Rückblicke und Motive in der Prophetie des Amos, Hosea und Jesaja* (BZAW 119; Berlin 1971) 87, Anmerkung 166.

⁽⁵⁾ H.-W. JÜNGLING, *Richter 19 – Ein Plädoyer für das Königtum* (Anal. Bibl. 84; Roma 1981) 95.

Was bedeutet **דבר על-לב** nun wirklich? Wie ist es zu übersetzen, besonders im Hinblick auf Jes 40,2?

2. Voruntersuchung I: **לב** bei DtJes

13 Vorkommen sind zu zählen: Jes 40,2; 41,22; 42,25; 44,18.19.20; 46,8.12; 47,7.8 (**לִבְּךָ**).10; 49,21 (**לִבְּךָ**); 51,7.

40,2 stellt in dieser Reihe einen Sonderfall dar: Nur hier ist das 'Herz', von dem der Text handelt, nicht das 'Herz' des grammatischen Subjekts der Aussage. In allen anderen Fällen handelt es sich um das eigene Herz des Subjekts.

Nur dreimal hat das Herz grammatikalisch wie semantisch eine positive Valenz (40,2; 49,21; 51,7). In den anderen Fällen erscheint viermal eine Negation, einmal ein Irrealis, und die restlichen fünf Vorkommen enthalten in unmittelbarer Nähe moralisch negative Ausdrücke.

Vom Kontext her gesehen, erscheint das Herz wenigstens zehnmal als Instrument der menschlichen Entscheidung, verantwortlich für moralisches Handeln⁽⁶⁾. Dabei klingt praktisch immer eine Bedeutung wie Aufforderung zur Bekehrung oder zur Rückkehr aus der Verstockung (also der Verweigerung der Bekehrung) an.

Zusammenfassend läßt sich sagen: 1) DtJes verwendet **לִבְּךָ** hauptsächlich zur Bezeichnung des entscheidenden Organs für sittlich richtiges Handeln. Meistens ist damit verbunden, daß bisher keine Bekehrung erfolgt ist. So zeigt sich denn das Herz als Verkörperung jener Urteils- und Liebesfähigkeit im Menschen, die ihn zu Gott führen sollte, obwohl sie ihn zunächst von Gott weggeführt hat. 2) Die Verwendung des Wortes **לב** in 40,2 hebt sich von der sonst bei DtJes üblichen ab. Zusammen mit 49,21 und 51,7 ist es die einzige Stelle, die einen positiven Kontext aufweist; doch wird 40,2 auch von diesen beiden nochmals durch eine sehr verschiedene syntaktische Konstruktion getrennt.

3. Voruntersuchung II: **דבר על-לב** bei DtJes, TrJes und Jer

Die Vorkommen sind: DtJes 40,2; 42,25; 46,8; 47,7. TrJes 57,1.11; 65,17. Jer 3,16; 7,31; 12,11; 19,5; 31,33; 32,35; 44,21.

Am weitaus häufigsten sind dabei die Verben **עלה** (6x)⁽⁷⁾ und **שיב** (5x) im Q verwendet, während **שוב** (Hi), **קנא** (Q) und **דבר** (Pi) nur je einmal auftauchen. **לב** bezieht sich in allen Texten, ausgenommen Jes 40,2 und Jer 31,33, auf das Subjekt oder den Sprecher zurück. In den meisten Fällen spricht Jahwe (wohl nicht in Jes 42,25 und 57,1). Es ist auffällig, daß der Satz, der **על-לב**

⁽⁶⁾ Ausnahmen sind: Jes 40,2; 49,21.

⁽⁷⁾ Davon 5x bei Jeremia, der es — mit Ausnahme von 3,16 — immer auf Gottes Herz bezieht. Die formelhafte Wendung **ולא עלתה על-לבי** (Jer 7,31; 19,5; 32,35) drückt Jahwes Ablehnung der Kinderopfer aus, und Jer 44,21 kehrt (parodiert?) die Aussage dahingehend um, daß Jahwe nun der falschen Opfer Judas gedenkt.

enthält, zehnmal verneint ist (Ausnahmen davon sind: Jes 40,2; 46,8. Jer 31,33; 44,21).

Bei Jes 65,17 und Jer 3,16 wird vorausgesetzt, daß Gott auf so überwältigende Weise Neues schafft, daß Israel nicht mehr an das alte Leid denken wird. In allen übrigen Texten (mit Ausnahme von Jes 40,2 und Jer 31,33) stellt der vorausgehende Kontext im selben Vers eine Situation dar, die nicht dem Willen Gottes entspricht, sei es, daß Israel verwüstet ist (Jer 12,11), sei es, daß Sünde bzw. die Strafe dafür vorliegt. Darauf folgt die traurige Feststellung, daß niemand es sich zu Herzen nimmt⁽⁸⁾. Ein von Gott mit der Züchtigung gewünschtes Umkehren, deren erster Schritt die innere, persönliche Annahme Jahwes und seines Wollens wäre, findet de facto nicht statt.

Davon heben sich nur Jes 40,2 und Jer 31,33 ab. Beiden ist gemeinsam, daß Gott am Herz von Jerusalem/Israel handeln läßt oder sogar selbst handelt. Doch liegt in Jer 31 offenbar eine geprägte Wendung vor, die mit der in Jes 40 nicht zusammenhängt. *כתב על-לב* ist ein idiomatischer Ausdruck, der wahrscheinlich eine Nähe zu 'auswendiglernen' hat; so erscheint unsere Stelle von allen anderen herausgehoben.

In all dem zeigt sich, daß die Sonderstellung von Jes 40,2 in der Verwendung von *לב* sich auch hier beim Ausdruck *על-לב* fortsetzt. Der Grund dafür liegt wohl zum großen Teil an den sehr unterschiedlichen Verben.

4. Hauptuntersuchung: *דבר על-לב*

Die zehn Vorkommen sind: Gen 34,3; 50,21; Ri 19,3; 1 Sam 1,13; 2 Sam 19,8; Jes 40,2; Hos 2,16; Rut 2,13; 2 Chr 30,22; 32,6.

Davon ist 1 Sam 1,13 auszusondern, einmal, weil es die einzige rückbezügliche Verwendung unseres Ausdrucks ist, zum zweiten, weil vom Kontext her ein stilles Zu-sich-selber-Reden gemeint ist, das mit allen übrigen Texten keine Gemeinsamkeit hat. Vermutlich handelt es sich um einen Fall der in den Samuelbüchern häufigen Vertauschung von *אל* und *על*⁽⁹⁾. Dann liegt hier ein Beleg für die Redensart *דבר אל-לב* vor. Sie ist in Gen 24,45 belegt, wo es sich um ein Selbstgespräch des Knechtes Abrahams handelt⁽¹⁰⁾.

Die übrigbleibenden neun Texte möchte ich in zwei Gruppen teilen. Zuerst sind da solche, die von fast allen Übersetzungen und Kommentatoren als problemlos empfunden und sehr ähnlich wiedergegeben werden. Dazu gehören Gen 50,21; 2 Sam 19,8; 2 Chr 30,22; 32,6. Stets sind Männer angeredet. Es liegt eine öffentliche Gesprächssituation vor — nichts ließe an eine Liebes-

⁽⁸⁾ Jes 57,11 formuliert in der 2. Person feminin singular. Die in der Anmerkung 7 erwähnten Texte zeigen sinngemäße Reaktionen Jahwes.

⁽⁹⁾ S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford 1913) 12: 'There is a tendency, however, in these two books to use *על* and *אל* interchangeably'. Und auf Seite 14 schreibt er zu unserem Vers 1 Sam 1,13: 'It is another instance of *על* = *אל*'.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Es läßt sich zeigen, daß weder die Präposition *על* durch *אל* oder *ב* noch das Verb *דבר* durch *אמר* ersetzt werden darf, ohne daß der Ausdruck völlig andere Bedeutung erhält. Immer ergeben sich dann rückbezügliche Konstruktionen als Ausdruck eines Selbstgesprächs.

beziehung zwischen den Gesprächspartnern denken. Fast einstimmig wird hier überall mit 'aufmuntern, ermutigen' oder einer vergleichbaren Wendung übersetzt⁽¹¹⁾.

Zur zweiten Gruppe gehören die Texte Gen 34,3; Ri 19,3; Rut 2,13; Jes 40,2; Hos 2,16. Für alle diese Stellen, und ganz besonders für Hosea, finden sich Autoren, die darin die Redewendung דבר על-לב als eine Bezeichnung für Liebessprache, und zwar speziell für werbende, hofierende Liebe deuten. Die meisten Kommentatoren und Übersetzer machen es sich leicht, indem sie eine Wort-für-Wort-Übersetzung vorlegen, obwohl es die dann entstehende Wendung in ihrer eigenen Sprache gar nicht gibt.

Gen 34,3

Sichem, Sohn des Hiwwiterfürsten Hamor, hat Dina, die Tochter Jakobs, vergewaltigt. Obwohl die Tat dem Impuls eines Augenblicks entsprang, bleibt sein Sehnen an Dina hängen, er liebt sie *ידבר על-לב הנער*.

So sehr Sichem auch aus Liebe handeln mag, die Erzählung erwähnt keinerlei Reaktion Dinas, geschweige denn ihre Gegenliebe. Die Erzählung ist also offenbar nicht daran interessiert, ob hier wechselseitige Liebe zustandekommt. Der Ausdruck *דבר על-לב* steht an der Stelle, wo nach der Logik der Erzählung Sichem versuchen muß, für den durch die Vergewaltigung entstandenen Schmerz und Schaden Dinas Wiedergutmachung zu leisten. Sichem sieht in der Liebe zu Dina sein Unrecht ein und will nun, Verzeihung suchend, sie beruhigen, trösten und gleichzeitig auch aufmuntern, indem er ihr sagt, daß er sie zur Frau nehmen will. Der letzte Punkt muß die Hauptsache gewesen sein. Jedenfalls wird im Lauf der Erzählung das Faktum der Vergewaltigung zum zentralen Punkt, sodaß es verwunderlich wäre, wenn Sichem diesem Aspekt im Gespräch mit Dina nicht vorrangige Bedeutung gäbe. Vorgeschlagene Übersetzung⁽¹²⁾: ... und er suchte das Mädchen zu beruhigen.

Ri 19,3

Im vorhergehenden Vers ist textkritisch ein Wort unsicher, das entscheidend für den Sinn ist. MT bietet *ומונה*, was einen Ehebruch der Frau als Vorspiel zu ihrer Rückkehr annehmen läßt. LXX liest *καὶ ὠργισθη*, was sich auf hebräisches *ומונה* zurückführen ließe, und, wenigstens implizit, die Schuld eher dem Mann zuschriebe, was dann auch in der Logik der Perikope läge, da ja

⁽¹¹⁾ Bei 2 Sam 19,8 scheint der Kontext eine Wiedergabe mit 'leutselig reden' nahezulegen.

⁽¹²⁾ In diesem und den folgenden Übersetzungsvorschlägen versuche ich, mich von Wort-für-Wort-Wiedergaben zu lösen und im Sinne dynamischer Äquivalenz die jeweils sachgemäßeste deutsche Übersetzung zu bieten. Ob es in einer an Leitworten interessierten Bibelübersetzung möglich wäre, einen einzigen durchgehenden Ausdruck zu finden, und wenn ja, ob in diesem auch ein Stück des hebräischen Bildes erhalten bleiben könnte, bleibt dabei offen. Siehe dazu auch den vorletzten Absatz der Zusammenfassung.

der Levit mit seiner Reise nach Betlehem sich zum Teil schuldig bekennt⁽¹³⁾.

Setzt man einen berechtigten Grund für die Rückkehr der Frau in ihr Vaterhaus voraus, wird רַבֵּר עַל-לֵב nicht als Liebesgespräch zu verstehen sein, sondern vielmehr als ein Reden, in dem der Levit sich zu entschuldigen und seine Frau zu überzeugen versucht, noch einmal mit ihm zu beginnen. Doch auch wenn die Schuld bei der Frau liegt, wäre es schwer, hier ein trantes Gespräch von Herz zu Herz zu verstehen; zu sehr erscheinen die beiden Partner voneinander entfernt. Als Übersetzung paßte gut: 'um sie umzustimmen'.

Rut 2,13

Statt nur als Fremde geduldet zu sein, erhält Ruth eine Einladung zum Essen und Trinken (2,9) und Anerkennung für ihr Handeln, nämlich, daß sie der Noemi gefolgt ist und sich unter den Flügeln Jahwes geborgen hat. Sie antwortet: 'Möge ich Gnade finden in deinen Augen, Herr, da du mich doch getröstet שפחתך רַבֵּר עַל-לֵב, wo ich doch nicht einmal eine von deinen Mägden bin'. Ruth arbeitet weiterhin auf dem Feld und erhält zusätzliche Vergünstigungen.

Die Szene steht am Anfang der Begegnungen zwischen Boaz und Ruth. Es handelt sich nicht um eine Liebeserklärung des Boaz⁽¹⁴⁾; eine aufkeimende Liebe beginnt, sehr verhalten ausgedrückt, erst später im 3. Kapitel, wo aber bezeichnenderweise der Ausdruck רַבֵּר עַל-לֵב nicht auftritt. Mit unserer Redewendung ist hier das erbarmende, einführende Sorgen des Boaz angesprochen, der ihr das Ährenlesen auf seinem Acker und das Trinken bei seinen Leuten erlaubt und der so das Leben und die Stimmung von Ruth angenehmer und leichter gemacht hat. Eine gute Wiedergabe von רַבֵּר עַל-לֵב wäre hier 'und so einführend zu deiner Magd gesprochen hast'.

Jes 40,2

Der doppelte Aufruf Gottes, sein Volk zu trösten, wird durch zwei Imperative fortgeführt: 'Sprecht zum Herzen Jerusalems und ruft ihr zu'. Der Grund für diese tröstliche Ankündigung liegt darin, daß jetzt Jerusalems Schuld vergeben ist und alle seine Sünden abgebußt sind. Es scheint, daß hier mit רַבֵּר עַל-לֵב eine Steigerung des parallelen נָחַם gemeint ist, welche gut mit 'muntert Jerusalem auf' übersetzt werden kann.

⁽¹³⁾ Der beste Überblick über die textkritische Diskussion zu dieser Stelle ist zu finden in: D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 50/1; Freiburg 1982) 116. Danach unterschied schon David ben Abraham zwei verschiedene Bedeutungen von נָחַם, eine erste, 'sich prostituieren', und eine zweite, nur hier vorkommende, 'mit dem Mann nicht einverstanden sein'. G. R. DRIVER, "Mistranslations in the OT", *WO* 1 (1947-1952) 29-30, nimmt aufgrund des Akkadischen 'zinû' eine zweite homonyme Wurzel נָחַם mit der Bedeutung 'zornig werden, zürnen' an. — H.-W. Jüngling vertritt in der neuesten Monographie zur Stelle dieselbe Lösung wie Driver. (*Richter* 19, 84).

⁽¹⁴⁾ *Traduction œcuménique de la Bible* (Paris 1980) 1587, Anmerkung i.

Hos 2,16

Israel, Jahwes Ehefrau, ist durch ihren Götzendienst untreu geworden. Jahwe will sie deswegen bestrafen (2,11-15), an ihr ihre Vergehen heimsuchen. V. 16 bringt durch ganz andere Töne eine unerwartete Wendung hinein. Jahwe spricht: 'Deswegen, siehe, אנכי מפתה und will sie in die Wüste führen ודברתי על-לבה (V. 17) Und ich will ihr ihre Weinberge von früher zurückgeben...'

Zieht man die Tatsache in Rechnung, daß Israel sich gegen seinen Gott vergangen und Ehebruch begangen hat, daß, abgesehen von Hos 2,9c, kein Motiv einer Umkehr bei Israel zu finden ist, und daß für das Tun Jahwes פתה 'verführen/betören' ⁽¹⁵⁾ gebraucht wird, verbietet es sich, דבר על-לב als Sprechen zwischen zwei Liebenden zu verstehen. Vielmehr wird es sich – ähnlich wie in Ri 19,3, doch hier ohne Schuld des Mannes – um den Versuch seitens Jahwes handeln, seine Frau zurückzugewinnen.

Diese Deutung wäre noch durch weitere Argumente zu verstärken. Erst in Hos 2,17b wird von einer Antwort Israels geredet; doch selbst in dem Augenblick, wo Jahwe seine Frau zurückgekauft und bei sich im Haus hat (nach Kapitel 3), beginnen noch lang keine Liebesgespräche. So läßt sich kaum annehmen, daß bereits in Hos 2,16 ein solches vorliegt. Und auch die Assoziation Wüste = Ort der Liebe läßt sich schwer aufrechterhalten. Im Hld 3,6; 8,5 ist die Wüste gerade der Ort, von dem die Braut hinaufzieht (עלה מן); als Ort des trauten Gesprächs erscheint dagegen der Garten oder das Haus. Noch ein Letztes: Es ist möglich, die Partizipialform מפתה als Überschrift zu verstehen, unter die die drei nächsten sich auf Jahwe beziehenden finiten Verben zu stellen sind. Dann aber würde es noch schwerer, in דבר על-לב hier einen Ausdruck der Liebessprache zu sehen. – In der Übersetzung wäre Hos 2,16b am besten wiederzugeben mit: 'und ihr zureden'.

5. Zusammenfassung

In keinem einzigen Fall wird דבר על-לב für ein trautes Tête à Tête-Gespräch zwischen zwei Liebenden verwendet; ja es ließe sich sogar umgekehrt sagen: Wo dieser Ausdruck aufscheint, da ist die Situation verkehrt, schwierig, oder es liegt eine Gefahr in der Luft. So zeigt sich, daß die eingangs zitierte Vermutung, die Redewendung דבר על-לב sei in der Liebessprache zu Hause, wohl unzutreffend ist. Kein einziges Beispiel läßt sich dafür finden.

Dagegen wird dieser Ausdruck durch zwei Pole geprägt: Der eine wird durch den dreimal belegten Parallelismus mit נחם dargestellt ⁽¹⁶⁾, der andere

⁽¹⁵⁾ פתה bedeutet nicht notwendigerweise 'verführen' in erotisch/sexuellem Kontext, sondern kann jede Art von Herbeiführung einer Meinungsänderung sein. So in Spr 1,10 vom lockenden Überreden der Sünder, in 2 Sam 3,25 vom Auskundschaften Davids durch den Feldherrn Abner, in Spr 16,29 mit Bezug auf Gewalttat, in 1 Kön 22,20-22 vom verblendenden Überreden Achabs. Vgl. dazu THAT II, 497.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Gen 50,21; Jes 40,2; Rut 2,13.

durch die in 2 Chr zweimal in Erscheinung tretende Betonung des Mutes. Meistens oszilliert die Bedeutung und begreift beides, Trost und Mut, in sich.

Weiter läßt sich feststellen, daß immer Angst, Sorge, Sünde oder Vergehen in unmittelbarer Nähe beherrschend sind oder erwähnt werden. Ihretwegen spricht dann jemand 'zum Herzen' dessen, der sich in dieser Lage befindet, und löst so die angstbesetzte Situation auf.

Darüberhinaus besteht (mit Ausnahme der beiden Chronikstellen und des Textes in Ruth) eine weitere Gemeinsamkeit: Bei allen Vorkommen steht eine Schuld im Raum, sodaß **דבר על-לב** immer die zusätzliche Bedeutung von 'Verzeihung suchen' oder 'Vergebung schenken' mitträgt.

Gerade diese Nähe von Angst oder Schuld läßt zumindest fragen, ob die Präposition **על** in unserer Redewendung nicht den Sinn 'gegen' hat. Nimmt man dazu aus den Bedeutungsmöglichkeiten von **לב** die von 'Einstellung, Gesinnung, Stimmung (und zwar mit negativem Beiklang)' und von **דבר** die Nuance 'einreden, zu überzeugen versuchen', so ergäbe sich als Wort-für-Wort-Übersetzung von **דבר על-לב**: gegen das Herz von jemandem anreden. Die Grundbedeutung des Ausdrucks wäre dann 'gegen eine vorhandene (negative) Einstellung anreden = umzustimmen versuchen'.

Mit diesen Ergebnissen noch einmal auf Jes 40,2 zurückkommend, wird zum einen deutlich, wie typisch und präzise DtJes die Redewendung gebraucht. Das Schimmern zwischen Trost und Mut, das Lösen einer angstbesetzten Situation und Vergebung schenken als Konnotation treffen genau die zentrale Aussage der Redewendung und der Stelle. Zum anderen ergibt sich durch die Opposition zu den übrigen Vorkommen von **לב** bzw. **על-לב** eine Spannung besonders innerhalb der Verwendung des Wortes Herz. Wenn in den meisten Vorkommen das Herz als mitbeteiligt an Sünde und Entzweiung aufscheint, so setzt Jes 40,2 pointiert dagegen: Das Herz ist auch der Punkt, an dem Gottes vergebender Trost und befreiendes Heil eingreift.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
via della Pilotta 25
00187 Roma

Georg FISCHER

Beth Aven

Wir können uns das Entsetzen seiner Zeitgenossen ausmalen, als der Prophet Hosea das Staatsheiligtum des Nordreichs, Bethel, ein "Sündenhausen", *bêt 'āwen*, nannte (Hos 4,15; 10,5). Ein Teil dieser Beunruhigung teilt sich dem modernen Exegeten mit: ist Beth Aven nichts weiter als eine polemische Entstellung des Namens "Bethel", oder ein genuiner Ortsname? G. Schmitt hat — nicht ohne Vorgänger — überzeugend nachgewiesen, daß letzteres der Fall sein muß⁽¹⁾; er kann sich auf Hos 5,8⁽²⁾; 1 Sam 13,5; 14,23; Jos 7,2; 18,12 berufen, Stellen, die zu Polemik keinen Anlaß boten. Doch wo lag "Sündenhausen"?

G. Schmitt sucht den Ort in der Nachbarschaft Bethels, des heutigen *bētin*, hat aber große Schwierigkeiten, dort eine geeignete Ruinenstätte ausfindig zu machen⁽³⁾. Tatsächlich werden die aufgeführten Stellen bei Hosea und Am 5,5 verständlicher, wenn die Propheten auf einen Namen Bethels anspielen, als auf eine verlassene Ruinenstätte der Umgebung, und auf Bethel weist auch 1 Sam 14,23⁽⁴⁾. Jos 7,2 und 18,12-13, die Beth Aven und Bethel trennen, können die Beweislast für das Gegenteil nicht tragen. In Jos 7,2 ist 'im *bêt 'āwen* sekundär aufgrund von Jos 18,12 eingetragen⁽⁵⁾. Jos 18,12-13 ist aber deutlich von Jos 16,1-2 abhängig⁽⁶⁾, einem Text, der seinerseits — historisch unzutreffend⁽⁷⁾ — zwischen Bethel und Luz unterscheidet. Indem Jos

(1) G. SCHMITT, "Bet-Awen", *Drei Studien zur Archäologie und Topographie Altisraels* (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients B 44; Wiesbaden 1980) 33-76.

(2) "Dir nach, Benjamin" ist ein ephraimitisches Kriegsgeschrei, cf. VF., "Zum Text von Ri 5,14", *Bib* 64 (1983) 428 Anm. 5, so daß sich die Erwägungen SCHMITTS, "Bet-Awen", 33-34 erübrigen.

(3) SCHMITT, "Bet-Awen", 51-58. Entweder sind die möglichen Lokalisationen schon für überzeugendere Gleichsetzungen vergeben, wie *et-tell* bei *dēr dubwān* für *hā-'ay*, oder es fehlen eisenzeitliche Baureste, wie bei *hirbet el-ḥudriya* (ibid., 57).

(4) Cf. SCHMITT, "Bet-Awen", 66.

(5) Cf. M. WÜST bei G. SCHMITT, "Bet-Awen", 37 m. Anm. 12.

(6) 18,13 übernimmt — sinnwidrig — aus 16,2 den Lokativ-Terminativ *lūzā* (cf. M. WÜST bei G. SCHMITT, "Bet-Awen", 43 m. Anm. 19), 18,12 ist *midbārā bêt 'āwen* "in die Wüste von Beth Aven" gegenüber 16,1 **ham-midbār bêt 'el* "in die Wüste, nach Bethel" (nach LXX, cf. SCHMITT, "Bet-Awen", 45) deutlich die unanstößigere und häufigere (cf. SCHMITT, "Bet-Awen", 45 Anm. 21), also sekundäre Konstruktion. Angesichts dieser klaren Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse kann die Annahme von SCHMITT, "Bet-Awen", 48, 50, nicht überzeugen, 16,1-2 und 18,12-13 gingen je für sich auf eine gemeinsame Vorlage zurück und Bethel in 16,1-2 sei gegenüber Beth Aven in 18,12 sekundär.

(7) Cf. M. WÜST, "Bethel", *Biblisches Reallexikon* (ed. K. GALLING) (HAT I,1; Tübingen ²1977) 44.

18,12 das *bêt 'ēl* seiner Vorlage 16,1 durch *bêt 'āwen* ersetzt (*hî' bêt 'ēl* ist seinerseits Glosse zu *lūzā* wie in Gen 35,6), bestätigt die Stelle die Identität beider Orte, wie es auch der Redaktor tut, der für das Nebeneinander von 1 Sam 13,2 und 13,5 verantwortlich ist⁽⁸⁾.

Man könnte einwenden, daß Bethel mit zwei Namen — Luz "Mandelbaumhain"⁽⁹⁾ und eben Bethel — schon hinreichend ausgestattet sei. Doch ist Mehrnamigkeit von Orten eine verbreitete Erscheinung im alten wie modernen Orient. Hebron hieß zugleich Kirjath Arba⁽¹⁰⁾, Jerusalem in der Spätzeit des Alten Testaments außerdem Zion und Gottesstadt⁽¹¹⁾. Rabbath Ammon hieß seit dem zweiten Ptolemaios auf griechisch Philadelphia, doch blieb der alte Name im Gebrauch (Ῥαββατάμωνα Polybios V. 71,4) und hat sich schließlich behauptet. Heute heißt Damaskus zugleich *eš-šām* und *dimašq*, wobei die Wahl der Namensform von der stilistischen Ebene abhängt, auf der sich der Sprecher gerade bewegt. Die Mehrnamigkeit wird dadurch erleichtert, daß Ortsnamen im Semitischen in der Regel morphologisch und semantisch durchschaubar sind, daher neue Namen für alte Orte jederzeit gebildet werden können.

Aber wer außer einem puritanischen Eiferer würde schon eines der bedeutendsten Wallfahrtsheiligtümer seines Landes "Sündenhausen" nennen⁽¹²⁾? Wir müssen daher annehmen, daß die Vokalisation *bêt 'āwen* eine prophetische Böswilligkeit darstellt, die dann für die Überlieferer normativ geworden ist. Die Konsonanten erlauben eine andere Deutung, die nicht nur einen passenden, sondern einen auch anderenorts belegten Namen für ein Heiligtum ergäbe: **bêt 'awwān* "Zufluchtsstätte"⁽¹³⁾. **'Awwām* hieß der Haupttempel der sabäischen Hauptstadt Maryab, heute *mārib*⁽¹⁴⁾.

Aber ist es erlaubt, einen im Alten Testament überlieferten Ortsnamen unter Heranziehung der arabischen Bedeutung der Wurzel, von der er gebildet

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. SCHMITT, "Bet-Awen", 61-63.

⁽⁹⁾ Der Name ist älter als der bestimmte Artikel **han-* im Kanaanäischen Mittelpalästinas, denn sonst müßte es **hal-lūz* heißen wie *hā-'ay*.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Wobei beide Namen, "Bundesort" und "Vierstadt", vom gleichen Sachverhalt auszugehen scheinen!

⁽¹¹⁾ Der Ausgangspunkt der Namensbildung ist jeweils leicht zu erkennen.

⁽¹²⁾ G. SCHMITT, "Bet-Awen", 58 erwägt, ob der Name ursprünglich an der Wüste gehaftet habe und damit zu erklären sei, daß in Bethel ein Ritus praktiziert wurde, der dem in Lev 16 beschriebenen ähnlich gewesen sei. Doch *'āwen* bezeichnet nicht metaphysische Unheilsverfallenheit, sondern konkretes zwischenmenschliches Fehlverhalten, cf. K.-H. BERNHARDT, "*'āwen*", *TWAT* I, 151-159, und kommt darum in Lev 16 wie in der ganzen Priesterschrift nicht vor.

⁽¹³⁾ Vgl. arabisch *'WY* "sich begeben zu, Schutz suchen bei"; die Vokalisation ist lediglich ein Vorschlag (kontraktionslanges *ā* bleibt im masoretischen Hebräisch erhalten, zur Lokalendung *-an*, *-ān* cf. W. BORÉE, *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas* [Hildesheim 1968] 63-64). Eine Rekonstruktion des Namens als **bêt 'ōn* (vgl. *'ōnō* Esr 2,33 u.ö.) läßt sich nicht ganz ausschließen; LXX βαῖθων Jos 18,12 bzw. βαῖθων (Codex A) setzen allerdings nicht notwendigerweise ein anderes Lexem als *'āwen* voraus.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Die Vokalisation *'Awwām* des nur vokalloos überlieferten Namens *'wm* ist konventionell, seine Deutung mithilfe der Wurzel *'WY* jedoch unbestritten (*-m* ist die südarabische Mimation). Cf. zum Tempel H. VON WISSMANN (†), *Die Geschichte von Saba II. Das Großreich der Sabäer bis zu seinem Ende im frühen 4. Jh. v. Chr.* (ed. W. W. MÜLLER) (SÖAW.PH 402; Wien 1982) 183-190.

ist, und unter Bemühung einer altsüdarabischen Parallele zu deuten? Die Antwort mögen vorläufig einige Beispiele geben. Hebräisch *g'bul*, altsüdarabisch *gbt*⁽¹⁵⁾ haben sich je über "Grenze" zu "Gebiet" entwickelt (wie lateinisch *finis*); das Etymon für beide Wörter liegt im arabischen *ġabal* "Berg" vor. Denn in sippenbäuerlich besiedelten Bergländern, wie es Palästina und Altsüdarabien waren, pflegen sich Stämme und Gaue in den Tälern heranzubilden, die Berge also Grenzen zu sein. Nicht nur im Lexikon, auch auf dem Gebiet der Toponomastik gibt es augenfällige kanaänisch-altsüdarabische Parallelen: in Moab finden wir *dibōn* und *mēpa'at*, in Saba' **dibān* und in Ḥaḍramaut *mayfa'at*⁽¹⁶⁾. Daraus ist nun nicht zu schließen, daß die Moabiter Südaraber waren. Anders als morphologische und, in geringerem Maße, phonologische Erscheinungen sind lexikalische Isoglossen für die Klassifizierung eines Dialekts wenig relevant, vielmehr Ausdruck für gemeinsames Erbe, Ergebnis paralleler Bedeutungsentwicklungen unter ähnlichen Lebensumständen oder Zeichen kulturellen Austausches.

Hebräisch *'WY* (*pi.*) "begehren"⁽¹⁷⁾ ist deutlich eine abstrahierende Weiterentwicklung von *'WY* "aufsuchen, Zuflucht suchen" (so noch im Arabischen). Wir dürfen darum annehmen, daß die ältere Bedeutung in der Vorgeschichte des Hebräischen einmal präsent war. Der Name *bēt 'el* ging vom Heiligtum aus und hat schließlich den Namen des Ortes verdrängt, wie *bait al-maqdis* "Jerusalem" und "Aelia" verdrängt hat. Zu einer gewissen Zeit, im Dialekt einer bestimmten Gegend könnte **bēt 'awwān* mit *bēt 'el* konkurriert haben, um schließlich außer Gebrauch zu kommen und nur in der polemischen Umdeutung seitens zweier Propheten zu überleben, so wie heute *bait al-muqaddas*, das lange Jahrhunderte neben *bait al-maqdis* stand, ungebräuchlich zu werden scheint.

Der Leser möge den Umweg über die ganze Länge der arabischen Halbinsel verzeihen: er war nötig, um von Bethel nach Beth Aven zu kommen.

Deutsches Evangelisches Institut
für Altertumswissenschaft
des Heiligen Landes,
c/o P.O.B. 183
Amman, Jordanien

Ernst A. KNAUF

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf. A. AVANZINI, *Glossaire des inscriptions de l'Arabie du Sud II* (Quaderini di Semitistica 3; Florenz 1980) 253.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. zu *Mayfa'at* H. VON WISSMANN, *Die Geschichte von Saba' II*, 35-36, zu *Dibān* W. W. MÜLLER, *Die Wurzeln Mediae und Tertiae Y/W im Altsüdarabischen* (Diss.phil. Tübingen 1963) 53. Cf. zu syropalästinisch-südarabischen Ortsnamenisoglossen noch B. J. ISSERLIN, "Place Name Provinces in the Semitic-speaking Ancient Near East", *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, A VIII* (1956-1959) 92 fig. 4, 94 fig. 5, 96 fig. 6, 98 fig. 7. Genealogisch steht das (südsemitische) Südarabische dem (über einem südsemitischen Substrat zentralsemitischen) Arabischen nicht näher als dieses dem (zentralsemitischen) Kanaänischen, cf. vorläufig R. M. VOIGT, Rez. R. HETZRON, *The Gûnnân-Gurage languages*, *ZDMG* 130 (1980) 87-89.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Auch im Altsüdarabischen sind von *'WY* bislang nur abgeleitete Stämme belegt, cf. MÜLLER, *Wurzeln*, 27-28; AVANZINI, *Glossaire II*, 69.

Sens dynamique de l'expression λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν en 1 P 2,9

Dans la Première épître de Pierre nous trouvons une expression très intéressante, unique dans toute la Bible: λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν. L'auteur l'utilise en 1 P 2,9 pour désigner les chrétiens comme peuple de Dieu. La phrase s'inspire manifestement d'un passage du livre de l'Exode où Dieu déclare: Ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος... βασιλείον ιεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον (Ex 19,5-6; 23,22 LXX). Les titres d'honneur promis au peuple de l'Ancienne Alliance sont appliqués dans l'épître aux chrétiens: Ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλείον ιεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ... (1 P 2,9). On perçoit en même temps dans ce texte l'influence d'Is 43,20-21 où Dieu promet de réaliser de nouveaux prodiges en faveur de sa «race élue», de son «peuple», qu'il a préservé pour raconter ses hauts faits: τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν, λαόν μου ὃν περιποιήσάμην τὰς ἀρετὰς μου διηγείσθαι (Is 43,20-21).

L'expression de 1 P 2,9, cependant, n'est identique ni à celle d'Ex 19,5 (λαὸς περιούσιος) ni à celle d'Is 43,21 (λαόν μου ὃν περιποιήσάμην). La différence principale consiste dans l'emploi de la préposition εἰς. Il convient de tenir compte de ce changement, c'est-à-dire de cette préposition, et de se demander s'il s'agit d'une modification intentionnelle, susceptible d'apporter à l'expression une nuance nouvelle.

Les traducteurs, en général, se reportent aux textes de l'Exode et d'Isaïe et font comme si le texte de 1P ne comportait pas la préposition εἰς. La Traduction Œcuménique de la Bible assimile 1 P 2,9 à Is 43,21 et traduit: «un peuple que Dieu s'est acquis»; la Bible de Jérusalem s'inspire d'Ex 19,5 et met: «un peuple acquis»⁽¹⁾.

(¹) Des traductions semblables ont cours dans d'autres langues, v.g. Revised Standard Version: «God's own people»; Einheitsübersetzung: «ein Volk, das sein Eigentum wurde»; Traduzione della C.E.I.: «un popolo che Dio si è acquistato»; Nueva Biblia Española: «pueblo adquirido por Dios».

De nombreux commentaires en restent à cette interprétation: P. DE AMBROGGI, *Le Epistole cattoliche di Giacomo, Pietro, Giovanni e Giuda* (La Sacra Bibbia; Torino 1947) 106: «popolo di riservato possesso [di Dio]»; C. SPICQ, *Les Epîtres de saint Pierre* (Sources Bibliques; Paris 1966) 92: «un peuple privilégié»; E. BEST, *1 Peter* (New Century Bible; London 1971) 108: «God's own people: lit. 'a people for possession'»; L. GOPPELT, *Der Erste Petrusbrief* (KEK Meyer; Göttingen 1978) 179: «(das Gott) eigene Volk»; R. FABRIS, *Lettera di Giacomo e Prima lettera di Pietro* (Bologna 1980) 195: «il POPOLO che Dio si è acquistato». Les commentateurs de langue anglaise sont en général plus attentifs à traduire la proposition grecque; cf. déjà C. BIGG, *A Critical and Exegetical*

Il est vrai qu'à l'époque du Nouveau Testament, on observe dans certains textes un affaiblissement du sens de εἰς; cette préposition pouvait perdre sa valeur dynamique et devenir équivalente à ἐν suivi du datif⁽²⁾. Cette évolution, cependant, n'était pas universelle. Dans son article sur «L'emploi dynamique de εἰς dans saint Jean et ses incidences théologiques»⁽³⁾, I. de la Potterie a montré que tous les emplois de cette préposition dans les œuvres de saint Jean présentent un caractère dynamique, même lorsque, à première vue, on peut avoir l'impression contraire. De même, l'évangile de Matthieu et les épîtres du Nouveau Testament maintiennent bien la distinction entre la préposition dynamique εἰς et la préposition statique ἐν⁽⁴⁾.

I. En 1 P 2,9 rien ne suggère que la préposition εἰς soit à prendre en un sens affaibli. De nombreuses raisons invitent, au contraire, à lui conserver toute sa valeur dynamique:

1. J'ai observé une fréquence significative de la préposition εἰς dans la Première de Pierre. Elle y est employée 42 fois, alors que cet écrit est relativement bref. Ce chiffre correspond à 2,5% du vocabulaire de la lettre, densité la plus élevée parmi tous les écrits du Nouveau Testament.

2. Cette préposition s'impose fortement dès le commencement de la lettre: ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν... εἰς κληρονομίαν... εἰς σωτηρίαν... (1 P 1,3-5), et elle donne à ce début un grand élan dynamique, car elle y est unie aux idées d'espérance, d'héritage à recevoir, de salut qui va se révéler. Il serait étonnant qu'elle perdît soudain sa valeur.

3. Si nous considérons la structure de la première partie de l'épître selon la proposition de M.-A. Chevallier⁽⁵⁾, nous sommes amenés à remarquer une correspondance, dans la péricope de 2,1-10, entre le εἰς σωτηρίαν de 2,2 et notre εἰς περιποίησιν de 2,9. La préposition est identique de part et d'autre et les substantifs ont des significations apparentées. La correspondance entre le début et la fin de cette péricope ne se limite pas à ce détail. Début (2,1-3) et fin (2,9-10) parlent des fidèles et de leurs relations avec le Christ et avec Dieu, tandis que le centre (2,4-8) développe le thème du Christ-pierre (2,4.6.7.8). La phrase du début exprime un dynamisme de croissance: ἵνα... αὐξηθῇτε εἰς σωτηρίαν. Elle suggère un sens dynamique pour l'expression symétrique, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν.

4. Cette expression est d'ailleurs suivie, dans la même phrase, d'une autre locution, qui contient un εἰς extrêmement dynamique, car il s'y trouve

Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude (ICC; Edinburgh 1902) 134: «a people for a peculiar possession», cf. ci-dessous n. 11.

(2) Cf. M. ZERWICK-M. GROSVENOR, *Biblical Greek* (Rome 1963) nn. 99-111; BLASS-DEBRUNNER-REHKOPF, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen 1976) nn. 205ss; J. MOULTON, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh 1963) 254ss.

(3) *Bib* 43 (1962) 366-387.

(4) M. ZERWICK-M. GROSVENOR, *Biblical Greek*, n. 106.

(5) M.-A. CHEVALLIER, «1 Pierre 1/1 à 2/10: structure littéraire et conséquences exégétiques», *RHPR* 51 (1971) 129-142.

en contraste avec un ἐκ et sert de complément au verbe «appeler»: τοῦ ἐκ σκοτόους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς. Ce εἰς τὸ ... φῶς reprend en quelque sorte le εἰς περιποίησιν et en confirme la valeur dynamique. Dans les deux cas, il s'agit d'une finalité fixée par la bonté de Dieu.

5. Dans le Nouveau Testament, trois autres textes comportent l'expression εἰς περιποίησιν. Celle-ci a, chaque fois, un sens nettement dynamique: ἔθετο ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεός... εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας, «Dieu nous a destinés... à posséder le salut» (1 Th 5,9); ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς... εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης τοῦ Κυρίου, «il vous a appelés... pour que vous acquériez la gloire du Seigneur» (2 Th 2,14); ἄλλα πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς, «mais [hommes] de foi pour la sauvegarde de l'âme» (He 10,29)⁽⁶⁾. L'orientation de ces trois textes contribue à éclairer celle de l'expression moins explicite de 1 P 2,9. Il ne s'agit jamais d'une possession déjà acquise, mais d'une destination, conforme à un appel qui demande une adhésion de foi.

6. L'expression se trouve deux fois dans la LXX. En Ag 2,9 il s'agit d'une addition au texte hébreu; dans celui-ci, Dieu promet à propos du second Temple: «Et dans ce lieu je donnerai la paix»; la LXX a ajouté: καὶ εἰρήνην ψυχῆς εἰς περιποίησιν παντὶ τῷ κτίζοντι... On peut comprendre que Dieu donnera la paix de l'âme «*en possession*» à tout bâtisseur de son Temple, ou qu'il donnera la paix de l'âme «*en vue du salut*». Dans un cas comme dans l'autre, notre expression, précédée du verbe «donner» au futur, a clairement un sens de destination.

L'autre texte est celui de Malachie 3,17. Parlant de ceux qui le craignent, Yahweh promet: Καὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς ἡμέραν ἣν ἐγὼ ποιῶ εἰς περιποίησιν. Pour cette dernière expression, le texte hébreu a le simple mot *segulla*, sans aucune préposition. La LXX a ajouté εἰς, insistant ainsi sur la nuance de destination, déjà présente dans le verbe, qui est au futur.

Toutes ces constatations vont dans le même sens. Elles donnent à penser que le εἰς de 1 P 2,9 n'est pas statique, mais dynamique. Λαὸς εἰς... doit se traduire «un peuple destiné à..., en chemin vers...».

II. Quel est, en ce cas, le sens précis de περιποίησις? Ce terme, on le sait, a deux significations principales, comme le verbe dont il dérive:

1) acte de sauver, de sauvegarder; 2) acte d'acquérir, acquisition⁽⁷⁾.

Les traducteurs qui négligent la préposition prennent le second sens. En s'inspirant du texte hébreu d'Ex 19,5, ils traduisent: «peuple acquis». S'ils examinaient pour elle-même la version grecque, ils devraient déjà être moins assurés; celle-ci, en effet, emploie περιούσιος, terme qui, pour un lecteur grec, peut signifier «sauvé» aussi bien que «réservé»⁽⁸⁾. Dans le texte grec

⁽⁶⁾ A. VANHOYE, *La structure littéraire de l'épître aux Hébreux* (Paris 1976) 180.

⁽⁷⁾ A. BAILLY, L. SÉCHAN, P. CHANTRAINE, *Dictionnaire grec-français* (Paris 1950) *sub verbo*; F. ZORELL, *Lexicon graecum Novi Testamenti* (Paris 1961) *sub verbo*.

⁽⁸⁾ F. ZORELL, *Lexicon graecum N.T.*, 1040, note cette possibilité. Περιέμμι, en effet, signifie souvent «survivre» et περιουσία, selon Bailly, a pour premier

d'Is 43,21 — utilisé aussi, nous l'avons dit, en 1 P 2,9 — l'expression ὃν περιποιησάμην peut également se traduire: «le peuple que j'ai sauvé» et, dans le contexte, ce sens paraît plus naturel, car il s'agit de salut et non pas d'acquisition; en Is 43,14 Dieu est appelé «le rédempteur» et en 43,20 il déclare: «J'ai donné de l'eau dans le désert et des fleuves en terre aride pour abreuver ma race élue...», ce qui est bien une action salvifique.

L'utilisation en 1 P 2,9 de certains termes d'Ex 19,5-6 et d'Is 43,20-21 ne constitue donc pas une difficulté pour l'adoption du sens de «salut» dans l'expression λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν. Le texte d'He 10,39 cité ci-dessus atteste clairement ce sens pour le N.T. et on peut l'appuyer d'un texte de Luc qui emploie le verbe correspondant, περιποιέομαι, dans le sens de «sauver»⁽⁹⁾. Ajoutons que tous les emplois de περιποίησις dans le N.T. se trouvent dans un contexte de salut, et de salut eschatologique (Ep 1,14; 1 Th 5,9; 2 Th 2,14; He 10,39)⁽¹⁰⁾.

Lorsqu'on admet le sens dynamique de la préposition εἰς, le sens d'«acquisition» ne convient pas pour περιποίησις⁽¹¹⁾. «Peuple en vue d'une acquisition» serait une expression obscure. S'il s'agit d'une acquisition que le peuple doit faire, une précision s'imposerait. Que va-t-il acquérir? S'il s'agit d'être acquis par Dieu, l'idée ne s'accorde pas avec le contexte, car celui-ci

sens «le fait d'être sauvé». Dans le contexte de l'Exode, cette signification ne manque pas de probabilité.

⁽⁹⁾ Il s'agit de Lc 17,33: «Qui cherchera à sauver (περιποιήσασθαι) sa vie, la perdra»; le texte parallèle en Lc 9,24 a le verbe σώσαι. Rappelons l'équivalence indiquée par Ps.-Platon, *Defin.* 415c: σωτηρία, περιποίησις ἀβλαβής. En 2 Ch 14,12 la LXX a rendu par περιποίησις l'hébreu *mihya* dont le sens premier est «vitae conservatio» (F. ZORELL, *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum V.T.*, Rome, 1955, 436) et qui désigne dans le contexte des rescapés.

⁽¹⁰⁾ On peut soutenir que dans tous ces textes περιποίησις a un sens, ou au moins une connotation, salvifique. Pour Ep 1,14, le seul sens que lui donne LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, est «those who are saved». La même remarque vaut pour le verbe en Ac 20,28, texte souvent cité pour éclairer 1 P 2,9. Elle vaut également pour le verbe λυτροῦσθαι, utilisé en 1 P 1,18, que les commentateurs invoquent aussi pour appuyer le sens d'acquisition en 1 P 2,9; ce verbe signifie avant tout une action de délivrance et non une opération commerciale.

⁽¹¹⁾ Plusieurs commentateurs qui retiennent à juste titre le sens dynamique de εἰς conservent cependant le sens d'«acquisition» pour περιποίησις ou, plus exactement, le sens de «possession», qui n'est pas identique et n'est clairement attesté nulle part (le seul exemple qu'en donne Bailly est le texte de 1 P 2,9!). C. Bigg, cité ci-dessus, n. 1, traduit: «a people for a peculiar possession», sens inspiré de l'hébreu *segulla*, mais non du grec περιποίησις. D'autres commentateurs adoptent une interprétation semblable: E. G. SELWYN, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (London 1947) 166: «for God's own possession»; F. W. BEARE, même titre (Oxford 1961) 92: «for God's prized possession»; J. N. D. KELLY, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (Black's N.T. Comm.; London 1969) 82: «for God's possession». F. W. Beare explique qu'il s'agit d'un peuple «which finds the end of its existence in its possession by God» (p. 105) et J. N. D. Kelly reprend cette idée (p. 99). La *Sagrada Biblia*, versión por F. Cantera Burgos y M. Iglesias Gonzales (BAC; Madrid 1975) traduit: «pueblo para [ser] patrimonio [de Dios]».

affirme que les chrétiens sont déjà le peuple de Dieu: νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ (2,10); ils n'ont plus à le devenir.

Mieux vaut donc choisir le sens de «salut». Tout devient alors clair et cohérent. Les chrétiens forment un «peuple destiné au salut»⁽¹²⁾, au salut définitif lors de la «révélation de Jésus Christ» (1,7.13). C'est bien dans cette direction que nous orientent, pour 1 P 2,9, les relations entre l'expression étudiée et l'ensemble de son contexte. Les observations que nous avons faites à ce sujet et qui appuient l'aspect dynamique de la préposition, ces mêmes observations appuient également le sens de «salut» pour le substantif.

En effet, l'élan dynamique du début de l'épître se porte explicitement «vers le salut» (εἰς σωτηρίαν: 1,5). Le mot revient deux fois dans les versets suivants (1,9.10) et le salut y est défini comme le «terme» (τέλος) qu'on atteint grâce à la «foi» (πίστεως). L'expression de 2,9 — rappelons-le — est en rapport direct avec l'honneur décerné aux «croyants» (πιστεύουσιν: 2,7).

Dans la péricope de 2,1-10 le parallélisme observé entre εἰς σωτηρίαν au début (2,2) et εἰς περιποίησιν à la fin (2,9) suggère pour περιποίησις un sens salvifique et non un sens commercial. La locution dynamique qui se trouve dans la suite de la phrase (2,9) enrichit le thème du salut: celui-ci consiste à être délivré des ténèbres et à être appelé par Dieu «à (εἰς) son admirable lumière». On peut voir dans cette expression, en quelque sorte, un commentaire de εἰς περιποίησιν.

Tous ces indices montrent que l'expression de 1 P 2,9, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ne doit pas se traduire «un peuple que Dieu s'est acquis», mais bien plutôt «un peuple destiné au salut», «un peuple en chemin vers le salut». Il faut, en tout cas, tenir compte de la préposition εἰς et mettre un fort accent sur le caractère dynamique de l'expression. Ce caractère dynamique s'accorde bien avec les allusions à l'Exode. En effet, il suggère que les fidèles, nouveau peuple de Dieu, sont en voie vers une nouvelle Terre Promise, le salut. Ils appartiennent déjà à Dieu, mais ils ne sont pas encore en possession du salut définitif; ils sont en mouvement vers lui. La tension vers le salut est un aspect important de leur situation, une exigence aussi de leur vocation, car Dieu est «celui qui [les] a appelés des ténèbres à son admirable lumière» (2,9).

Grand Séminaire
des Prêtres du Sacré-Cœur
32-422 Stadniki 81
Pologne

Stanislas HAŁAS SCJ

⁽¹²⁾ A. VANHOYE, *Prêtres anciens, Prêtre nouveau dans le Nouveau Testament* (Parole de Dieu; Paris 1980) 270.

The Meaning of πλήρωμα in Nag Hammadi

Is the appearance in the New Testament of certain words like γνῶσις, σοφία, σῶμα, and πλήρωμα evidence of the existence of first century gnostic thought with which early Christianity had come into contact? Some scholars have concluded that it is⁽¹⁾ while others believe that the evidence is too inconclusive⁽²⁾. The purpose of this brief study is to examine the occurrences of the word *pleroma*⁽³⁾ in the most important gnostic corpus extant, the Nag Hammadi library⁽⁴⁾, and to see what light, if any, such an examination may shed on the question.

Before examining this word in Nag Hammadi a survey of the word in other literatures would be helpful. (1) *Classical Usage*. More than once in Euripides *pleroma* has the meaning of "full contents"⁽⁵⁾. "Whole sum", "totality", and "full measure" are possible meanings also⁽⁶⁾. (2) *Non-Literary Usage*. Several examples are cited in Moulton and Milligan in which *pleroma* means "complement", "sum", and "ship-load" or "fully-manned

(1) J. B. LIGHTFOOT, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (London 1879) 73-113; H. SCHLIER, *Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief* (BHT 6; Tübingen 1930); E. KÄSEMANN, *Leib und Leib Christi* (BHT 9; Tübingen 1933); G. BORNKAMM, "Die Häresie des Kolosserbriefes", *TLZ* 73 (1948) 11-20; P. POKORNÝ, "Epheserbrief und gnostische Mysterien", *ZNW* 53 (1962) 160-194; H.-M. SCHENKE, "Der Widerstreit gnostischer und kirchlicher Christologie im Spiegel des Kolosserbriefes", *ZTK* 61 (1964) 391-403; W. G. KÜMMEL, P. FEINE, and Johannes BEHM, *Introduction to the New Testament* (New York and Nashville 1966) 67.

(2) E. PERCY, *Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe* (Lund 1946); P. BENOIT, "Corps, tête et pleroma dans les Épitres de la captivité", *RB* 63 (1956) 5-44; S. LYONNET, "L'étude du milieu littéraire et l'exégèse du Nouveau Testament: Les adversaires de Paul à Colosses", *Bib* 37 (1956) 27-38; Idem, "Col 2,18 et les mystères d'Apollon Clarien", *Bib* 43 (1962) 417-435; Idem, "Saint Paul et le gnosticisme: la lettre aux Colossiens", in U. BIANCHI (ed.), *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo* (Leiden 1967) 538-561; H. HEGERMANN, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum* (TU 82; Berlin 1961); G. MÜNDELER, "Die Erwählung durch das Pleroma", *NTS* 8 (1962) 264-276; A. ANWANDER, "Zu Kol 2,9", *BZ* 9 (1965) 278-280; G. DELLING, "πλήρωμα", *TDNT* 6 (1968) 283-311; F. O. FRANCIS, "The Christological Argument of Colossians", in J. JERVELL (ed.), *God's Christ and His People* (Nils Dahl Festschrift; Oslo 1977) 192-208; C. A. EVANS, "The Colossian Mystics", *Bib* 63 (1982) 188-205.

(3) Of all the so-regarded gnostic vocabulary *pleroma* is the most common and, possibly, the most controversial.

(4) Quotations are taken from J. M. ROBINSON (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library* (Leiden and San Francisco 1977).

(5) Cf. DELLING, 298.

(6) DELLING, 299.

ship”(7). These examples conform to classical usage. We can agree with G. Delling that *pleroma* “denotes in particular completeness, the absence of any lacune”(8). (3) *Usage in the LXX*. Along with *pleroma* the LXX uses *plerosis* and at times the difference is not at all clear. The distinction that Lightfoot had attempted to maintain (i.e., that *pleroma* is always passive and *plerosis* is always active) simply will not hold up(9). *Pleroma* and *plerosis* occur approximately 20 times almost always translating מלא, e.g., “The earth is the Lord’s and its fulness” (Ps 23,1); “The sea and its fulness” (Ps 95,11; 97,7). In at least two places the reference is to the completion of time (cf. Ezek 5,2; Dan [Θ] 10,3). However, in the majority of cases the word has a spatial meaning(10). (4) *Usage in the Apostolic Fathers*. Interestingly enough *pleroma* is quite rare in these writings. It occurs in 1 Clem. 54,3 where Ps 23(24),1 is quoted. Ignatius uses it twice, once in his greeting in *Trallians* and once in *Ephesians*: “...blessed with greatness by the fulness of God the Father”. This last reference is reminiscent of Col 2,9 and will be discussed below. (5) *Usage in the Hermetic Corpus*. In this literature *pleroma* has an abstract sense that clearly goes beyond the physical sense of the word as it is found in the LXX and the earlier literature of the classical period (cf. 6,4; 12,16; 16,3). However, the word does not have the cosmological meaning of Christian Gnosticism(11). (6) *New Testament Usage*. Within the New Testament one can observe most of the nuances already surveyed in the literatures above. The spatial idea found in the LXX is well represented (e.g., Mark 2,21 [= Matt 9,16]; 6,43; 8,20; Rom 11,12,25; 1 Cor 10,36) as well as the abstract idea (e.g., John 1,16; Rom 13,10; 15,29; Gal 4,4; Eph 1,10,23; 3,19; 4,13; Col 1,19; 2,9). In what way, if any, some of the latter occurrences have gnostic meaning will be explored below.

Now that the complete Nag Hammadi library is available it is possible to make an exhaustive study of *pleroma*. Such a study hopefully will enable us to understand better in what way the New Testament’s use of this word relates to gnostic usage. *Pleroma* occurs numerous times in the Nag Hammadi library as would be expected(12). Several examples of the use of *plero-*

(7) *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids 1930) 520.

(8) DELLING, 298.

(9) So the criticism of many commentators, cf. C. F. D. MOULE, “‘Fullness’ and ‘Fill’ in the New Testament”, *SJT* 4 (1951) 79-86, esp. 83.

(10) DELLING, 299.

(11) DELLING, 300. Although the word carries no special significance in Philo, the verbal cognate πληροῦν is used in connection with God’s filling the cosmos. “He fills (πληροῦν) and embraces all else, that which is deficient (ἐμδεῖ) and waste and empty” (Delling’s translation, p. 289). Delling also adds: “...everywhere ...deploying His powers through earth and water, air and heaven. He has not left any part of the universe empty”. As the context would indicate, God fills the universe, not spatially as in pantheism, but with his operations (so Delling).

(12) It occurs approximately 100 times (in the extant materials which represent 90% of the original library), most often in the singular, and frequently in reference to the heavenly realm and the Powers or Aeons within.

ma are cited here in order to view the variety of contexts and nuances⁽¹³⁾. In the *Second Treatise of the Great Seth* the "All", "assembly", and *pleroma* are distinguished (VII, 50,30-34). In the *Thought of Norea* Norea will be able to "behold the Pleroma" (IX, 28,24-25). Elsewhere we are told that "the Demiurge cast a shadow over the syzygy and the Pleroma" (*Val. Exp.* XI, 39,16-18). In *On Baptism B* we have some interesting parallels: "from the carnal into the spiritual, from the physical into the angelic, from the created into the Pleroma" (XI, 42,14-17). The *Gospel of Truth* provides several descriptive phrases: "The Word that came forth from the Pleroma" (I, 16,33-34); "glorify the Pleroma" (I, 41,1); "his own resting place is his Pleroma" (I, 41,13-14); "all the emanations of the Father are pleromas" (I, 41,15-16). From the *Treatise on the Resurrection* we read that the Son of Man is restored to the *pleroma* (I, 44,30-34); and "strong is the system of the Pleroma" (I, 46,35-36). The *Tripartite Tractate* reads, "He (the Father) is in a Pleroma which is perfect" (I, 69,41-70,1). In the *Apocryphon of John* we have, "I am the remembrance of the Pleroma" (II, 30,16).

Frequently, *pleroma* is modified. A few examples may be noted: "preexistent pleromas" (*Tri. Trac.* I, 85,32); "image of the Pleroma" (I, 94,11-12); "power of the Pleroma" (I, 136,21); "whole Pleroma" (*Ap. John* II, 14,2); "all the pleromas" (*Gos. Egyp.* III, 59,15); "infinite Pleroma" (III, 54,5); "Pleroma above and below" (*Dial. Sav.* III, 131,10-11); "Pleroma of imperishability" (2 *Ap. Jas.* V, 46,8); "intellectual Pleroma" (*Ap. Pet.* VII,

⁽¹³⁾ There are at least two examples of non-technical meaning: "first-born of the pleroma of grace" (*Prayer of the Apostle Paul* I, A24); "This pleroma of truth" (*Ap. Pet.* VII, 71,2-3). Both of these references should be compared to John 1,16. It should also be pointed out that the Coptic synonym *ptērf* also occurs frequently and is usually translated "the All." It appears to have a thematic function in the *Gospel of Thomas* (cf. log. 2, 67, 77) and occurs frequently in several other tractates, e.g., the *Dialogue of the Savior*, *Zostrianos* (in VIII, 18,22 it is plural), *Melchizedek*, the *Testimony of Truth*, *Marsanes*, the *Interpretation of Knowledge*, *A Valentinian Exposition*, *Allogenes*, *Trimorphic Protennoia*, and from the Berlin Gnostic Codex, the *Gospel of Mary*. The meaning of *ptērf* varies not only from one tractate to another, but within a given tractate itself. In the *Gospel of Thomas* if one understands the meaning of Jesus' words he will reign over the All. In the *Dialogue of the Savior*, Mariam spoke "as a woman who knew the All" (III, 139,12-13). In *Zostrianos* the worthy path is described as "knowledge of the All" (VIII, 25,16). In *Melchizedek* the Savior gives life to the All (IX, 4,5-6) while in *Marsanes* the Father looks upon the All and "takes care of them" (X, 1,24-25). In the *Gospel of Mary* the Soul said that the All is "being dissolved" (BG 8502, 15,21). Compare the similar threat of dissolution in the Hermetic Corpus 16:3b). Sir 43,27 offers an interesting parallel: "He [God] is the All." Elsewhere in the *Nag Hammadi Library* some of the translators translate *ptērf* as "totality" (cf. *Tri. Trac.* I, 63,3; for plural cf. 55,39-40) or as "Entirety" (cf. *Hyp. Arch.* II, 86,31-87,27; 88,12). It would appear that *ptērf* is indeed synonymous with *pleroma*. One could cite *Tri. Trac.* I, 116,28-30: "The Savior was a bodily image of the unitary one. He is the Totality [*ptērf*] in bodily form." This passage is probably an allusion to Col 1,19 (compare also Heb 1,3). Although the Greek loan word *pleroma* does not occur in the *Hypostasis of the Archons* Col 1,13 is quoted and it seems apparent that *ptērf* has the same meaning.

83,13-14); "entire Pleroma" (*Val. Exp.* XI, 27,21). Fortunately we do have a few passages which define more fully *pleroma* and its relationship to what is termed the "deficiency". As will be seen the *pleroma* is understood as the exact opposite of the deficiency and, in fact, it is the objective of the *pleroma* to overcome and restore the deficiency. From the *Treatise on the Resurrection* we read: "For imperishability descends upon the perishable; the light flows down upon the darkness, swallowing it up; and the Pleroma fills up the deficiency" (I, 48,38-49,5; cp. 1 Cor 15,53-54). In the *Apocryphon of John* we have: "Thus the seed remained for a while assisting him in order that, when the Spirit comes forth from the holy aeons, he may raise him up and heal him from the deficiency, that the whole Pleroma may again become holy and faultless" (II, 25,9-16). In the *Dialogue of the Savior* the disciples ask the Risen Christ about the *pleroma* and the deficiency. "The disciples said to him, 'What is the Pleroma and what is the deficiency?'" He said to them, 'You are from the Pleroma, and you dwell in the place where the deficiency is' (III, 139,13-18). *Authoritative Teaching* contrasts "descent" with *pleroma*: "Whether she [i.e., the Soul] is in the descent or is in the Pleroma..." (VI, 22,18-19). Another interesting contrast is given in the *Discourse on the Eighth and the Ninth*; "Allow us through the spirit to see the form of the image that has no deficiency, and receive the reflection of the Pleroma from us through our praise" (VI, 57,5-9; cp. 2 Cor 3,17-18). Probably the classic passage on the deficiency and the *pleroma* is found in the *Letter of Peter to Philip*: "The apostles answered and said, 'Lord, we would like to know the deficiency of the Aeons and their Pleroma'" (VIII, 134,19-22). This question is followed by several related ones after which the Risen Christ begins to give his answers. In the explanation that follows, the deficiency, it is explained, was due to the "disobedience and the foolishness of the mother". It seems that Authades (or "Arrogance") produced an untrue copy of the *pleroma* out of the matter that had been unwisely produced by the "mother". When the Risen Christ finally explains the *pleroma* it is in terms of gnostic redemption. Jesus is himself the *pleroma* who wishes to rescue the spiritual seed from the realm of the deficiency. "Next concerning the Pleroma, it is I. And I was sent down in the body because of the seed which had fallen away. And I came down to their dead product. But they did not recognize me; they were thinking of me that I was a mortal man. And I spoke with him who belongs to me. And he hearkened to me just as you too hearkened today. And I gave him authority in order that he might enter into the inheritance of his fatherhood. And I took... they were filled... in his salvation. And since he was a deficiency, for this reason he became a Pleroma" (136,16-137,4).

At this point a definition for *pleroma* may be suggested. *Pleroma* describes the heavenly realm in which the Father and the Aeons reside. It is contrasted with the "deficiency" which is to be identified with the physical cosmos (in which the evil powers reside), yet the *pleroma* is to fill up the deficiency in the sense of restoration and reconciliation (cf. *Ap. John* II, 25,9-16; *Treat. Res.* I, 48,38-49,5). As it relates to gnostic anthropology, the *pleroma* is the realm from which the "spirituals" (i.e., the Gnostics) come while

their earthly existence is in the deficiency, the realm from which the "hylics" come (cf. *Dial. Sav.* III, 139,13-18). The Redeemer descends into the deficiency as the embodiment of the *pleroma* in order to reconcile the spirituals and restore the deficiency (cf. *Ep. Pet. Phil.* VIII, 134,18-137,4).

It is in the idea of restoration and reconciliation that we find a significant parallel to Pauline thought. *Pleroma* occurs twice in Romans 11, a chapter in which Paul attempts to clarify the relationship of the Gentiles to Israel. Both usages are expressions of Paul's anticipation of final Jewish (v. 12) and Gentile (v. 25) reconciliation to God. In these passages *pleroma* has the idea of completion or achievement in the sense of reaching a goal. Elsewhere Paul develops the idea of the restoration of the cosmos itself (cf. Rom 8,18-25): "...the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay..." (v. 21). In Gal 4,4 the advent of Christ marked the "fulness of time" (cf. Eph 1,10). Although here the reference is temporal there is still the idea of completion or reaching a goal. From these references it is clear that for Paul the idea of the consummation of history, which would involve final reconciliation and restoration, was at least one important meaning expressed by the word *pleroma*. But in two letters whose Pauline authorship is disputed *pleroma* is used to describe divine attributes in a way that is somewhat reminiscent of references in the Hermetic Corpus. Colossians and Ephesians provide us with five such occurrences of *pleroma*, one of which refers to the "fulness of God" (Eph 3,19) and four of which refer to Christ (Col 1,19; 2,9; Eph 1,23⁽¹⁴⁾; 4,13). The Christ hymn of Col 1,15-20 complements the pre-Pauline Christ hymn of Phil 2,5-11 in a significant way⁽¹⁵⁾. The latter hymn asserts that Christ Jesus "emptied himself" (ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, v. 7) while the former declares that "all the fulness was pleased to dwell in him"⁽¹⁶⁾ (v. 19). Col 2,9 is a commentary on 1,19 and adds explicitness to the idea of the incarnation, a point which is of chief concern in the Philippian hymn. The contrasting concepts of "emptiness" (κένωμα or ὑστέρημα, cf. Phil 2,30 and Col 1,24) and "fulness" (πλήρωμα) came to play an important role in later gnostic cosmology. But in Colossians, however, *pleroma* refers to divine attributes and not to the heavenly realm. Therefore, it would be incorrect to understand *pleroma* in these passages in Colossians and Ephesians as having this gnostic technical meaning⁽¹⁷⁾. Nevertheless, E. Lohse is only partly correct when he concludes that gnostic usage of this word "cannot contribute anything to the explanation of Col 1:19"⁽¹⁸⁾. We

⁽¹⁴⁾ In all probability the "one who fills all things in all" (Eph 1,23) is meant to refer to Christ, especially in view of the preceding phrase, "the church, which is his body".

⁽¹⁵⁾ On the Christ hymns see J. T. SANDERS, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background* (SNTSMS 15; Cambridge 1971) 58-87.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Although grammatically permissible, it is not likely that ὁ θεός is the intended subject. See E. LOHSE, *Colossians and Philemon* (Philadelphia 1971) 56-58.

⁽¹⁷⁾ So DELLING, 304.

⁽¹⁸⁾ LOHSE, 57.

have observed in Nag Hammadi that occasionally the idea of reconciliation and restoration is attached to *pleroma* and this seems to be an important ingredient in Paul's thought as well. In fact, it is in the context of Col 1,19 that the idea of reconciliation is explicitly stated: "For in him all the fulness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile [ἀποκαταλλάξαι] to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross. And you... he has reconciled..." (1,19-22).

As Lyonnet and others have argued *pleroma* was a word in wide circulation in the first century⁽¹⁹⁾. Paul's usage of it was for the most part in keeping with the basic meaning attached to it in Stoic circles and, as was noted above, in the Hermetic Corpus. Paul's special contribution was to give the word a christological application and to relate it to Christ's role as redeemer. It is this idea that is taken up in later gnostic thought and given a cosmological dimension, a dimension which lay at the heart of the redeemer myth with which Gnosticism interpreted Jesus⁽²⁰⁾. "Fulness" is no longer simply the sum total of divine attributes, but a spiritual realm in which reside the "Aeons". And it is no longer a sin-tainted cosmos that longs for reconciliation and restoration, but it is a "deficiency" that must be swallowed up by the heavenly *pleroma* and from which the spirituals must be rescued.

I would suggest that the Nag Hammadi library greatly helps clarify the various nuances of the word *pleroma*. To be sure, the meaning attached to the word by the Valentinians, so well documented by the heresiologists, is frequently observed, but there is a certain looseness of definition as well⁽²¹⁾. Moreover, there are other similar and related terms which at times appear to be interchangeable. Therefore, it would seem apparent that whereas nowhere in the New Testament does *pleroma* function in the Valentinian sense at least one aspect of Pauline usage (i.e., reconciliation/restoration) is represented in the gnostic writings. I would also suggest that not one of the occurrences of *pleroma* in the Pauline corpus indicates gnostic thought either on the part of the author or on the part of his opponents⁽²²⁾. The inoffensiveness of the word is attested by Ignatius (ca. AD 108) who employs it neither in a didactic nor polemical context. The very fact that the word appears nowhere else in the Apostolic Fathers (late first to mid-second century) would tend to support the view that *pleroma* had not as yet taken on gnostic signification and so as yet was not part of the controversy which would emerge in full force by

⁽¹⁹⁾ See n. 2 above.

⁽²⁰⁾ See SANDERS, 121-132.

⁽²¹⁾ For this reason it might be more prudent to translate *pleroma* as "fulness" than to transliterate it as if every time it occurs it has a technical meaning. On many occasions it appears to lack the usual technical gnostic meaning. B. LAYTON (*The Gnostic Treatise on Resurrection* [HDR 12; Missoula 1979]) regularly translates *pleroma* as well as other Greek loan words.

⁽²²⁾ That the presence of *pleroma* and other related vocabulary items does not necessarily indicate a christological heresy at Colossae see Francis' study cited in n. 2 above.

the middle of the second century. This is not to say, however, that the redeemer myth that would eventually become central to Christian Gnosticism had no influence on first century Jewish and Christian communities. That possibility remains open⁽²³⁾.

Dept. of Religious Studies
Trinity Western College
7600 Glover Road
Langley B.C. Canada V3A 4R9

Craig A. EVANS

⁽²³⁾ The case that Schenke has made for understanding the author of Colossians as himself moving in a gnosticizing direction cannot be dismissed too quickly (see n. 1 above). The "eschatological reservation" does appear to have been replaced by a form of realized eschatology (cp. Rom 6,5.8 with Col 2,11-14; 3,1-4) as Robinson has contended (see his *Trajectories through Early Christianity* [with H. KOESTER, Philadelphia 1971] 30-46). If Schenke, Robinson, *et al.* are correct then early gnostic usage of Colossians, especially among Valentinians, becomes understandable. On Gnostic interpretation of Colossians see E. PAGELS, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia 1975) 137-140.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Dennis PARDEE, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters*. 247 p. Chico 1982. Scholars Press.

Edward Gibbon, when discussing the years from 248 to 268 A.D. in his *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, observed that the "confusion of the times and the scarcity of authentic materials oppose equal difficulties to the historian who attempts to preserve a clear and unbroken thread of narration. Surrounded with imperfect fragments, always concise, often obscure, and sometimes contradictory, he is reduced to collect, to compare, and to conjecture; and though he ought never to place his conjectures in the rank of facts, yet the knowledge of human nature, and of the sure operation of its fierce and unrestrained passions, might on some occasions supply the want of historical materials".

Biblical scholars can easily sympathize with Gibbon. How many of our questions, linguistic, literary, and historical, could be more confidently answered if only we had more information. Given this state of affairs, what little extra-biblical material there is from ancient Palestine assumes great importance and is closely studied. A large part of the Hebrew epigraphic material from the biblical period consists of letters, and Pardee's *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters* is intended as "a research tool for students and scholars interested in the study of Hebrew letters" (p. 5). The book treats the 48 letters from the biblical period. Each letter is discussed separately with bibliography, translation, philological notes and general comments. Vocalizations are provided in an appendix. Fragments of letter preserved in the Hebrew Bible and of Tannaitic letters preserved in Rabbinic literature are also given, as well as a discussion of Hebrew letter types. There are no photographs or hand copies of the inscriptional material.

The bibliographies are extensive and include any work with a photograph or hand copy (indicated by a "P" or "C" in the left margin of the bibliographical entry). They alone make the book indispensable for those interested in Hebrew letters and epigraphy.

This is not the place for a detailed discussion of Pardee's own notes and comments. Nevertheless, a few general observations are in order. The texts are short and often bristle with difficulties which "the knowledge of human nature, and of the sure operation of its fierce and unrestrained passions" do not help to solve. These difficulties frequently lead Pardee (as they have others before him) to an ingenuity which reflects desperation rather than genius. He interprets *kymm* in line 5 of the Yabneh-Yam letter, for exam-

ple, as *kayyāmīm*, understanding the phrase as a “pluralization of *kayyôm* ‘now’ with the meaning ‘a few days extending back from now’ = ‘a few days ago’” (pp. 21-22). What linguistic laws are operative here, what analogies relevant? Regarding *’mn* in line 11 of the same letter, he considers it likely that it “reflects the Hebrew penchant for using direct speech in narrative accounts” (p. 22). But how applicable is an artistic technique used in the highly crafted literature of the Old Testament for understanding a letter whose repetitiveness is elsewhere attributed to the “unlearnedness” of the reaper who dictated it (p. 23)?

When given a choice of explanations Pardee frequently chooses the least simple and elegant. He considers *’sm* in line 5 of the Yabneh-Yam letter as the 3d m.s. pf. In an article in *Maarav* 1 (1978) he provides his justification, saying that this explanation “provides an acceptable syntactic analysis which is superior to taking the form as the unmarked infinitive absolute” (pp. 42-43). But why is it superior? An infinitive absolute would be perfectly acceptable (see Gesenius – Kautzsch – Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar* [Oxford 1910] 113y, z), and Pardee’s analysis demands that “the finishing was perceived as consequent upon reaping, but that the storing was part of finishing” (*Maarav*, p. 43). Moreover, the construction that Pardee appeals to is rare and usually involves the co-ordination of two perfects. Similarly, his explanation of the phrase *brk 1* as “to pronounce a blessing in favor of someone to a deity” (p. 49; see also the references there cited) is possible but hardly preferable to the generally accepted “to bless by/in the name of”. In discussing the *m/n/hmyhw* of line 5 of Arad letter 11, Pardee apparently feels uneasy because the name *mēnahemyāhū* is unattested and prefers “to take the *mem* at the beginning of the line as the last letter of a word which began on the preceding line and read the common proper name *nēhemyāhū*” (p. 45). But *mēnahēm* is a well-attested hypocoristic name and to find a corresponding full name is not at all surprising. “Unattested” doesn’t always mean “improbable”.

In a number of places (pp. 35, 49) he calls some perfect forms “epistolary” perfects. There is nothing specifically “epistolary” about their use, though, so why use this term? They are simply examples of a use of the perfect long known from Old Testament prose (see Gesenius – Kautzsch – Cowley, 106i; Joüon, *Grammaire de l’hébreu biblique* [Rome 1947] 112f). If one wants to give them a name, the linguistic category “performatives” should be used, and they should be designated “performative perfects” (I would like to thank Prof. Norbert Lohfink for calling my attention to this term).

Several years ago, in a lengthy article in *The New York Review of Books*, Renata Adler discussed a book by Pauline Kael, a collection of Ms Kael’s film reviews for *The New Yorker* magazine. She said that only when they were read together did one realize how bad these reviews were. One has a similar sensation after reading Pardee’s book. When examined together it seems quite clear how little these Hebrew letters tell us, aside from the contribution they make to the study of Hebrew epigraphy. Many of Pardee’s notes and comments are of the type “we really don’t know but...” After the “but” follow various guesses, musings, opinions, but, in the end, we

don't *really know* much. See, for instance, the general comments on Lachish letter 3, a relatively long letter, in good condition, discovered almost fifty years ago. How much is surmised from so little!

Work on these letters must continue, even when it doesn't yield insights immediately applicable to reconstructing the background of the Old Testament, for such work is our discipline's analog to pure science. But this work should always be guided by sound methodology, and the scholar, heeding Gibbon's warning, "ought never to place his conjectures in the rank of facts".

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

Robert LAWTON, S.J.

-
- B. GROSSFELD, *The First Targum to Esther According to the MS Paris Hebrew 110 of the Bibliothèque Nationale*. XIII-242 p. 23 x 15. New York 1983. Sepher-Hermon Press.

La tradition textuelle atteste l'existence de trois Targums d'Esther dont le plus connu est le second (T II), très paraphrastique. Une controverse à propos de T I et T III (connu seulement par les Polyglottes d'Anvers et de Paris) s'est élevée entre P. Grelot et M. H. Goshen-Gottstein (*Bib* 56 [1975] 53-73; 301-329): T III (littéral) est-il le résultat de l'élagage de T I (Goshen-Gottstein) ou T I est-il un développement de T III (Grelot)? Dans un tel débat, il est essentiel de travailler sur une édition critique. Celle-ci faisant encore défaut, B. Grossfeld s'est proposé d'en préparer une à partir du ms de Paris *BN Hébreu 110*, avec un appareil critique reposant sur huit autres manuscrits. Le texte araméen est accompagné d'une version anglaise et d'un commentaire suivi qui permet de situer les traditions targumiques dans l'ensemble de la tradition juive. Suit le texte araméen (également traduit) des additions contenues dans les mss, mais non transcrites dans le ms 110, avant les *Index* et une *Bibliographie*. Une reproduction du ms de Paris est donnée à la fin du volume; mais elle est bien mauvaise, comparée à l'état excellent de l'original (ainsi la dernière page n'est pas barbouillée comme sur le fac-similé).

Cette édition rendra service pour une consultation rapide de T I (dont on pourra voir exactement les fluctuations dans le copieux appareil critique) et de ses traditions, grâce à l'abondant matériel comparatif fourni par le commentaire. Elle sera utile, en particulier, pour une étude des rapports entre Targum et Midrash. On sera donc reconnaissant à l'auteur pour ce nouvel instrument de travail, malgré ses limites et son caractère assez inégal.

C'est ainsi que l'on aurait souhaité une description détaillée du ms de base. Le ms 110 est en fait composite; la première partie, contenant le *Targum fragmentaire*, est d'une écriture totalement différente de celle des Hagio-

graphes. Il eût fallu surtout analyser la recension de T I qu'il contient, pour en exposer les mérites. Les raisons données pour ce choix (texte qui ne mélange pas T I et T II; lisibilité parfaite; intégrité du texte; date assez ancienne [1455] de la copie) ne suffisent pas. Il était opportun de noter aussi que T I est immédiatement suivi de T II (*trgwm 'hr yrwšlmy lmglt 'str*) qui contient également l'*Acte de vente d'Aman* (fol. 129b), introduit par *trgwm yrwš* comme dans T I (3,2).

G. fournit les éléments d'une édition critique. Mais peut-on dire que la sienne en soit une? Le texte de base est reproduit tel quel; mais la tradition textuelle n'est pas discutée à l'aide des données de l'apparat qui pourtant soulèvent souvent des problèmes. A 3, 10 l'anneau sigillaire du roi est appelé *gwšpnq'*, tandis que le ms S (Salamanque) propose le terme classique '*zqt*' (cf. Dn 6,18); au v. 12 apparaît la forme *qwšpnq'* alors que presque tous les témoins proposent (même S) *gwšpnq'*. Mais '*zqt*' apparaît dans le texte à 8,2 et nous vaut une note intéressante (p. 172) qui rappelle l'usage du Targum à Gn 38,18.25 et 41,42. A 6,1 nous trouvons le curieux attribut divin «justice-miséricorde» (*dyn' rhmyn*) qui n'est pas discuté, alors que l'apparat donne la leçon correcte (*rhmyn* seulement) de 4 mss.

Les vérifications sur le ms ne sont pas aisées. La reproduction n'est pas paginée et l'indication des folios (claire sur l'original) n'apparaît pas. Seules ont subsisté les réclames et trois notes marginales. A 1,11 (fol. 112b) un signe interlinéaire demande d'insérer *qwmwy* («devant lui»), noté en marge: c'est la leçon du ms R signalée dans l'apparat. Le commentaire n'en fait pas mention. A 7,2 on trouve «*Darius Cyrus*» dans l'apparat et dans le texte (muni de *n'* = «autre leçon»). Mais seul *Cyrus* se trouve dans l'original, avec variante dûment annoncée dans la marge (*n'* : *drywš*). A 1,1 le mot '*yhw*', noté dans la marge, passe aussi dans le texte sans prévenir. Le commentaire à 5,14 ne signale pas une omission par homoioteleuton ('*brhm*... '*yštyzb*), corrigée en marge. Le texte est rétabli en conséquence, mais avec une dittographie (*mynh yshq*).

La nature du commentaire est assez mal définie. Il fournit une comparaison précise entre TM et les données midrashiques et de longues notes touchant des sujets variés. Mais souvent, il démarque seulement le texte: une impression en italique des apports originaux de T I aurait suffi pour éviter ces répétitions.

G. avoue préférer la solution Goshen-Gottstein pour l'interprétation des rapports T I/T III. Son choix n'est pas motivé systématiquement, son propos n'étant pas une étude comparative exhaustive. Mais ses nombreuses allusions à T III (dont il signale même des *plus* par rapport à T I) invitent à prendre parti. Une comparaison de plusieurs chapitres nous laisse perplexe; à première vue, la solution de G.G. est en effet plus satisfaisante. Dans ce contexte, il faut relever que certains rabbins notaient déjà comme *tosephta* des ajouts de T I, comme 2,9 ou 7,6 (généalogie de Mardochée; cf. pp. 98 et 165). Il aurait été facile de signaler entre crochets ces différences entre T I et T III.

Relevons encore quelques points de détail. P. 8: la référence au v. 14 manque dans l'apparat. P. 61 (texte p. 25): «que tu entends» ('*nt šm*') est oublié dans la traduction. P. 114: «to subdued the (rebellious) providence»: comprendre, bien sûr, «province» (avec l'hébreu: *mdynh*). P. 150: la dériva-

tion *dwkws* < δούχας (sic) > *dux* est pour le moins discutable; dans le texte de *Meg* 15b, lire *šmnh* (8) et non *šmnym* (80), comme l'indique la version anglaise: 208.

Ces critiques veulent seulement montrer l'intérêt de l'entreprise de B. Grossfeld. Son édition commode aidera à débroussailler quelque peu la question difficile des rapports existant entre les trois formes du Targum d'Es-ther.

Via di Santa Chiara 42
00186 Roma

R. LE DÉAUT

Abraham TAL, *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch*, Part III Introduction (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects, edited by Aron DOTAN, volume VI); section hébraïque 179 p., section anglaise 159 p. Tell-Aviv 1983. Tell-Aviv University.

Nous avons présenté le premier volume de cette édition du Targum samaritain (TS) dans *Bib* 63 (1982) 579-582. Le volume II (1981) a suivi les mêmes principes, présentant parallèlement le ms J (le plus ancien) et le ms A. Mais, à partir de Nb 30, les deux mss étant identiques (A est une copie de J), J seul est reproduit (les variantes de A apparaissant dans l'apparat) et A sert à en combler les lacunes occasionnelles. Le vol. III discute amplement les rapports entre les deux mss. Pour restaurer le texte après Dt 27 où A est mutilé, on a utilisé C (un des mss de la synagogue de Naplouse) ou d'autres textes fragmentaires.

Tous seront reconnaissants à A. Tal pour le soin et la promptitude avec lesquels il a réalisé cette édition destinée à devenir classique. Pendant des siècles, les chercheurs n'ont eu à leur disposition que l'édition de J. Morin dans la Polyglotte de Paris (1645), reprise par celle de Londres (1657), reposant sur un mauvais ms (E = *Vat Sam* 2). Situation qui ne fut guère améliorée par celle de J. H. Petermann - C. Vollers (1872-91) dont le travail de Tal montre la totale insuffisance.

Cette Introduction a pour seul objectif de présenter le matériel rassemblé (tous les mss du TS), les méthodes d'analyse, les critères de sélection des mss et de justifier les principes adoptés pour l'édition. L'auteur le fait de façon convaincante. Il a eu raison, en particulier, au lieu de charger son apparat de centaines de formes étranges, d'exposer les phénomènes phonétiques et morphologiques qui en expliquent la naissance, retenant seulement les variantes qui pourraient refléter d'authentiques choix de lecture.

On trouvera quelques allusions passagères à des problèmes comme l'activité midrashique (p. 52) ou celui des anthropomorphismes (p. 84), mais non des études sur le contenu même des textes, les présumés herméneutiques,

les méthodes de traduction etc. qui devraient faire l'objet de recherches particulières. On ne trouvera pas non plus le *Glossaire* annoncé (vol. I, p. X). L'auteur y a renoncé, pour nous promettre mieux: un Dictionnaire de tout l'araméen samaritain qu'il prépare avec Z. Ben-Hayyim. Tout le matériel targumique est déjà programmé sur ordinateur (ce qui a permis, pour ce vol. III, des statistiques précises de récurrence de certains mots). C'était aussi le seul moyen permettant de justifier les diverses acceptions des termes (cf. vol. III, p. I-hébreu).

Les deux sections de l'ouvrage (anglais-hébreu) ne sont pas exactement identiques, bien que le schéma soit le même dans ses grandes lignes, avec des variations dans l'ordre de présentation et l'amplitude des commentaires. Nous conseillons vivement de ne pas négliger la partie hébraïque, souvent plus explicite, plus riche d'exemples et ... moins entachée d'erreurs typographiques. L'Index des termes araméens cités est commun aux deux sections et constitue un utile glossaire. Il n'y a pas de bibliographie générale, mais seulement une liste des ouvrages cités en abrégé.

Tal répartit les résultats de ses recherches en deux sections: I) Distribution, description et évaluation des mss et II) Critères suivis pour la sélection des mss à inclure dans l'édition. Les mss sont répartis en deux classes: d'abord (pp. 15-105) ceux qui figurent dans l'édition (texte et apparat), i.e. 8 mss écrits entre le XII^e et le XVI^e siècle (période où l'araméen était encore connu des lettrés), mais dont les prototypes remontent au temps de l'araméen vivant; puis (pp. 106-124) ceux dont il n'est pas tenu compte (parce que simples reflets infidèles des premiers).

Parmi les critères utilisés, citons le degré d'influence de l'hébreu et de l'arabe et les données linguistiques (vocabulaire, évolution sémantique, caractéristiques grammaticales), dans le cadre de l'évolution de l'araméen en Palestine. Cela le conduit à déceler dans les mss trois périodes: 1) Au début de l'activité littéraire en araméen, celui-ci est de même type que celui des Targums palestiniens juifs, peut-être même plus ancien, en raison d'une parenté plus étroite avec l'ar. de Qumrân et celui d'Onqelos (O). Cette étape (dont J est un bon représentant) culmine au IV^e siècle: 2) A l'époque talmudique remontent les plus anciens *piyyuṭim* et le *Memar Marqah*. Les textes s'éloignent de l'ar. classique; mais les scribes comprennent encore l'ar. et peuvent fournir des copies fidèles; 3) La conquête arabe, puis la vogue nouvelle de l'hébreu, l'oubli de l'araméen amènent l'apparition d'une langue hybride (hébreu-araméen-arabe) qui est celle des *piyyuṭim* plus récents et des *Chroniques*. Il faut ajouter une désaffection pour le Targum, qui perd sa place dans la liturgie dès le XIV^e siècle alors que circulait une version arabe dès le XI^e siècle environ. Le travail des scribes (du TS) a été forcément influencé par ces conditions nouvelles.

En dehors de l'intérêt considérable de cette édition pour le domaine des études samaritaines, il convient de souligner son importance pour les études targumiques en général. Ainsi elle permet de juger des affinités entre O et TS qui, dans les mss récents, doivent s'expliquer par des emprunts directs (comme dans A et M). A. Tal rectifie aussi la conception de P. Kahle d'un TS circulant en plusieurs versions jamais unifiées, dont aucune ne connut un traitement privilégié (comme O). Les mss ne permettent pas de conclure à

l'existence de diverses recensions. Ils ne diffèrent ni par leur structure littéraire, ni leur approche du TM, ni dans leurs traditions exégétiques: c'est la langue qui leur donne leur personnalité reflétant l'époque de la copie. On ne trouve pas ici le pendant du rapport O/Targums palestiniens (TP), version littérale ou paraphrastique. Les Targums juifs ont une histoire toute différente, en raison de l'importance que leur accordait la communauté. Un travail de fixation progressive (du contenu et de la formulation) commencera très tôt (début du II^e siècle pour O) et même les mss du Caire du TP reproduisent des textes soignés auxquels on accordait manifestement grande valeur. Toutefois des problèmes analogues se posent pour le TS et le TP. A quelle date situer l'araméen original et les premières mises par écrit? En tout cas, il paraît impossible de remonter à un TS primitif. Le travail de Tal fournit les bases et les méthodes pour l'établissement au moins d'une chronologie relative. Ses conclusions nous paraissent solidement fondées.

Rappelons que, selon R. Macuch (*Grammatik des samaritanischen Aramäisch*, Berlin-New York 1982, pp. 61-66), on devrait aussi tenir compte de l'araméen samaritain (très proche du galiléen: p. xxxiv s.) dans la discussion de certains termes du N.T. Si Tal a raison de faire remonter les origines du TS à une date assez haute, on ne devrait pas non plus (avec les précautions requises) le négliger dans l'examen de l'arrière-fond.

Nous nous contenterons de quelques remarques critiques sur des points secondaires. P. 20, n. 7: l'attribution du ms 179 au ms A par J. Ramón Díaz ne paraît pas bien sûre: il semble qu'il dit exactement le contraire: «Al primer golpe se clasificaría este fragmento 179 como parte del ms A si sus lecciones, distintas de A, no disuadieran» (*Est. Bib.* 18 [1959] 185). P. 40, n. 32: si Ramón Díaz plaçait les mss A et E dans le même groupe, ce n'est pas seulement sous l'influence de Kohn, mais pour avoir préparé (comme thèse) une édition de la Genèse, texte que nous avons eu entre les mains (cf. P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*², Oxford 1959, p. 200). P. 31: ajouter la référence (Gn 29,17) à la liste de variantes empilées. On la trouve dans l'hébreu (p. lb); *ibid.* (et p. 40): la formule «Jewish version» ou «Sam. version» pour parler du texte hébreu est ambiguë, le terme «version» désignant d'ordinaire le Targum. P. 56: dans la fameuse histoire de R. José, la traduction «the whole city» est exacte, à condition de remplacer 'r'h par q^rth (p. s'). P. 57, n. 18: une référence à l'édition anglaise de S. Liebermann (sic) était à propos, au lieu de celle de Jérusalem 1962 (ou 1963? Cf. p. qsg). P. 64: le dernier § donne un choix erroné d'exemples et l'hébreu dit le contraire de l'anglais: «Toute couverture dans la Torah est rendue par ksh dans J, que l'objet soit concret comme dans Ex 21,33 (corriger la référence p. 64) ... ou abstrait comme dans Gn 18,17» (p. sh). P. 65: l'hébreu est mal interprété (cf. p. sh). Gn 42,10 a šbr-'kl et Tal veut souligner que même 'kl est rendu par m^zwn selon la tendance ultérieure de l'ar. sam. à distinguer entre «pain» et «nourriture» en général. P. 71: dans la citation de Gn 22,12, écrire l'arabisme t^llq (au lieu de t^llh). Cf. p. 'd. P. 72, 2^e ligne: lire Sheqalim L^c et non L^d. P. 74: 3^e mot de la liste: après «for the price», restituer le mot b'wrq (avant l'arabe wrq). P. 86, 2^e ligne: lire «IInd person masc. plur.» (au lieu de sg). P. 87: pourquoi un? après «pointing at distant objects»? Il s'agit évidemment des démonstratifs lointains. Cf. l'hébreu p. pz. P. 88, 2^e ligne: lire infinitive, au

lieu de *imperative*. Cf. p. *ph*. P. 95: dans la liste d'arabismes, pour Gn 30, 40, supprimer «I will be surety for him» (qui est à sa place à la page suivante pour Gn 43,9) et ne garder que *flocks* (pour 'drym). Cf. p. *sd*. P. 119 (et p. 1): le ms E (= Vat Sam 2) n'est pas arrivé à Rome en 1645 (date de l'édition de J. Morin) ni en 1616 (comme il est dit p. 1). Il fut acheté à Damas en 1616 par Pietro della Valle, en même temps qu'un Pentateuque hébreu complet que Harlay de Sancy, ambassadeur de France, envoya en 1623 à l'Oratoire de Paris. C'est celui que Morin publia dans la Polyglotte de Le Jay, sur les instances du cardinal de Bérulle. Cf. DB V, 1421. Mais della Valle ne put rapporter son Targum à Rome qu'en 1626. Ses héritiers en firent don à la Vaticane en 1718. Cf. Assemani. P. 151: ajouter la référence à Gn 36,35 (pour *dqt*). P. 157: lire «Untersuchung seiner handschriftlichen Quellen», *Journal of Semitic Studies* (non *for*), *Pentateuchtargums*, non *Pentateuchstargum*. Malheureusement, la section anglaise fourmille d'erreurs de ce genre. Notons seulement que l'on trouve toujours *Abbreviations*, au lieu de *Abbreviations* et que le titre de l'ouvrage de S. Landauer est *Die Mâsôrâh zum Onkelos* et non *Massorah* (p. *qnw*) ni surtout *Mosorah* (p. 150).

Pour le profit des usagers, nous avons noté quelques erreurs de références, notre exemplaire ne comportant pas de liste d'*Errata*. P. IV (Table des matières): 122 (non 22) et 125-156 (non 146). P. 2: Gn XII, 13 (non 12). P. 8: Ex IV, 24 (non 25). P. 22, 2^e ligne: p. 55 (non 95). P. 23: Dt XII, 28a (non XXII). P. 25: Dt XI, 24 (non 21). P. 26, 3^e §: Dt XV, 3 (non XVI). P. 33: Gn XXXVI, 28 (non XXXV). P. 34: Gn XVII, 17 (non XII). P. 38: Gn XII, 4b (non 14b); Dt XXXIII, 1 (non XXXII); Gn IV,1-XII, 4a (non 14a). P. 44: Ex XXXIX, 31 (non 13); Lv XXVII, 3 (non XVII); Nb VII, 24-71 (non 17). P. 47: Nb XXXV, 11 (non XXV). P. 49: Gn XVIII, 24 (non VIII). P. 62: Sukka III, 9 (non 1). P. 66: Gn XXXVII, 15 (non XXVII). P. 90: Ex XII, 10 (non XXI). P. 93, ligne 7: suppléer XXI, 25. P. 98: Ex XVI, 31 (non XVII). P. 100, 2^e §: Ex XVI, 15 (non XVII) et 4^e §: Dt VIII, 13 (non 18). P. 108: *bkh* = Ex XV, 6. P. 131: lire XXVIII, 18. P. 148, 2^e §: Ex XXXVI, 4 (non 5).

Malgré quelques déficiences matérielles de la présentation, tous ceux qui s'intéressent aux études araméennes et targumiques se réjouiront d'avoir enfin, grâce au labeur du Prof. Tal, un instrument de travail exceptionnel. Pour le domaine samaritain, il vient à point tenir compagnie à la *Grammatik* de R. Macuch.

Via di Santa Chiara 42
00186 Roma

R. LE DÉAUT

Litterae intertestamentariae

Harm W. HOLLANDER, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 6). x-175 p. 24 × 15,5. Leiden 1981. E. J. Brill.

The riddle of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* has in recent years commanded some attention; but few have given it more than has Professor de Jonge, the supervisor of this now published doctoral thesis presented at the University of Leiden. The book's theme, modest though fundamental, argues for the redirection of scholarly attention back to the parenetic passages of the *Testaments*, choosing the use of Joseph's history as the focal point of its careful and well documented examination of the *Testaments'* ethical doctrine.

Each of the two consecutive stories of the lengthy *T. of Joseph* has its own short instructional appendix (10/1-4; 17/1-18/4). Both echo ideas already adumbrated in the thanksgiving psalm contained in the introduction to this *Testament* (1/3(4)-2/6) and draw a clear picture of Joseph as the model of endurance (*hypomonē*) as practiced by the man oppressed. Similar but briefer use is made of this same figure in three other *Testaments*: the *T. of Reuben* (4/8-10) introduces Joseph's refusal to fornicate as a virtue having far more than itself as a reward; the *T. of Zebulun* (8/4f) and the *T. of Simeon* (4/3-7; 5/1a) both compliment Joseph's lack of malice toward the brothers who had wronged him. Though the *T. of Levi* (13) mentions Joseph within its only parenetic passage, his appearance there is barely more than a passing allusion.

It is in the *Test. of Benjamin*, Hollander states, that the *Testaments'* author composes his final and most complete picture of his ethical ideal of man (*agathos anēr*). In six passages of varying length, elements and motifs drawn from the Psalms and wisdom literature are brought together in order to personify in Joseph the fear and love God, the keeping of commandments, and the love of neighbour.

At the end of the study, date and provenance of the *Testaments* remain the problems they have always been. This, plus Hollander's apparent (and frequent) assumption of unity of authorship, may seem to detract from the genuine contribution this thesis has made. Doubtless clues to the solution to one or more of the perennial difficulties connected with the *Testaments* are embedded in the ample background material with which Hollander has equipped his work.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta 25
00187 Roma

T. FRANXMAN

Philip R. DAVIES, *The Damascus Covenant*. JSOT – SS 25. 267 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1983. JSOT Press.

Of the two parts of the *Damascus Document*, the “Admonition” and the “Laws”, only the first (CD 1–8; 19–20) is the subject of this interesting and important analysis.

Since it was first published in 1910, CD has occasioned a wide range of speculation regarding its origins and purpose. Earlier studies, together with the principal contributions made since the publication of the *Dead Sea Scrolls* renewed interest in it, are summarized in Davies’ Introduction. Here he distinguishes two general approaches evolved by scholarship since the 50’s: one tends to consider CD as very much part of the whole Qumran picture, interpreting it by means of Qumran documents and using it to interpret them; the other concentrates on the text of CD and an exegesis thereof performed more or less in isolation, defining and solving problems within the context of CD itself. This present work, however, takes its point of departure from the publications of J. Murphy-O’Connor whose methods represent not a third approach but a combination of the two just mentioned.

The structure of the “Admonition” Davies supposes to be modeled on a covenant-formulary and to have four parts: historical prologue (1/1–4/12a); a legal section (4/12b–7/10a); a (secondary) development of the last phrase of the legal section (7/10b–8/21); and a supplement whose content applies to the Qumran settlers (19/33b–20/34). Taken together, the first three sections have, Davies points out, a catechetical force and explain in some detail the world-view of CD’s author(s).

Three consecutive discourses (each opening with “And now listen...”) make up the historical prologue. God’s historical rejection of Israel and His election of a remnant with whom a covenant is then made are the themes of the first and third; the second casts this series of divine actions into a doctrine of predestination; all three possess fundamental similarities of ideology. The nucleus of the “Admonition” thence continues with a critique of Judaism outside the community, a midrashic exposition of the origins of the community’s halachah, and finally a collection of the main points of the halachah itself — all three parts associated, thematically and redactionally, to the point of forming a unified “legal” portion of the document.

As a kind of running commentary on CD, it is this portion of the book that is the more interesting. The much discussed historical allusions and the significance of the individual halachoth are but two of the many issues to which Davies brings the accumulated fruit of past research as well as the force of his own consciously elaborated methods.

The third, or “warning”, section of the “Admonition” follows upon the “warning” (7/9–10a) which concludes the legal section as part of the blessing-curse formula annexed to conditions of covenant. Two passages now expand that simple warning and are, in Davies’ judgment, secondary (though obviously germane) to what precedes. Not so the “Admonition’s” fourth and final portion. Six themes (among which one, 20/1b–8a, is judged later than the others) are strung together in somewhat loose association and form an

appendix which the author claims originated at Qumran and refers to the concerns of that specific group.

The already adumbrated conclusions regarding the redaction of CD may be summarized as follows: CD is of three successively composed layers (sections 1 + 2, 3, 4); the mss. we possess are a Qumran recension of a document originating elsewhere; as such they contain secondary materials added by, and of interest to, the Qumran community; the secondary material includes (a) allusions to an individual opponent of the Qumran community, (b) a specifically Qumranic *Heilsgeschichte* (inserted into 1/1–2/1, the first discourse of the historical prologue), (c) warnings originally meant for outsiders now redirected toward Qumran community members (cf. B-text parallel to 8/2–19), and (d) some (possible) hostile references to the Temple (e.g., 1/4).

Thus it is clear just how far Davies' redaction criticism is prone to go in divorcing CD from a Qumran context while still retaining both an historical and a literary connection between the two. But his conclusions take him a bit further. CD, in its basic form, antedates the Qumran community and is a coherent document whose doctrine does not attack the Temple as such nor disagree with Jewish practice outside the community on any "specific predominant points". Furthermore, the solar calendar was divinely revealed during an exile which is more than merely symbolic and which originated with the conquest of Nabuchadnezzar.

It would appear that the phrasing of the various conclusions drawn on these several levels paints a clear picture into which the evidence fits but scarcely seems always to demand. In many instances, however, we are presented with a bit more than just working hypotheses, and, taken together with the best work done on CD in the last ten years, the results of Davies' work constitute a real step forward in the continuing process of trying to understand so important a document.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

T. FRANXMAN

Novum Testamentum

H. KOESTER, *Introduction to the New Testament*. Vol. One: History, Culture and Religion of the Hellenistic Age. Philadelphia/Berlin – New York 1982. Fortress Press / Walter De Gruyter.

This is the first half of *Einführung in das Neue Testament (im Rahmen der Religionsgeschichte und Kulturgeschichte der Hellenistischen und Römischen Zeit)* Berlin/New York 1980). The present study, covering from shortly before Alexander the Great to the Jewish insurrections in the 2nd Cent. AD, might better have been entitled: *History, Culture, and Religion in the Helle-*

nistic and Roman Periods. Part One, for it includes Roman intervention in Greece. Since this reviewer's competency is outside the area of Jewish studies, concentration here must be on the book as it strikes a classicist. First to be treated will be the translation, then the factual reliability and some misleading impressions and contradictions, and finally the disadvantage of the basically synchronic approach.

The translation, based on a lively, modern German style, is very good, though lacking some of the variety and grace of the original. Only on a few occasions has the translator fallen into a trap; e.g., "the *Satiricum* of Petronius", "*strategus*", "Zeus Olympius". (Here one might ask why we still need Latin spellings throughout a work on a Greek history and culture). There are a few clumsy expressions, perhaps reflecting the German; e.g., "in the New Comedy" "at the Eleusis", and a few too many "to be sure's". Some scholars may find the change from *vChr* and *nChr* of the German, into BCE and CE rather tendentious. Finally, a presentation of the bibliography as generally done in the English world might have facilitated consultation. In any case it does not go much beyond 1970.

Except for the strictly Jewish sections, the work makes no pretensions to groundbreaking originality, but the conservative approach is marked with clarity and common-sense throughout.

In a rather long review, E. Plümacher, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 233 (1981) 1-23, was very critical — really overcritical considering the nature of the work — of the factual reliability of the Greek and Roman sections. Koester has made appropriate corrections, but on a few occasions missed Plümacher's point. More frequently, statements are misleading or apparently contradictory. The reviewer suspects that originally influenced by the German school of historiography, the author then changed some of his views in the light of more recent scholarship without removing all inconsistencies.

Some examples. At times regarding the Roman entry into Greece he speaks of "insidious villainy", "purely imperialistic reasons", "purely for profit", but at 285 and 291 we have a very cautious statement alluding to the complexity of Roman motives and leaving the problem as an open question. (To Badian's work cited there, one should now add W. V. Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome* [Oxford 1979]). Wrong impressions might result from the following: Alexander conquered only the western and southern parts of Asia Minor (20); Aristotle's "didactic works" (unchanged in spite of Plümacher's protest) were in libraries from Aristotle's death to the time of Sulla (145) — see now F. H. Sandbach, "Plutarch and Aristotle", *Illinois Classical Studies* 7 (1982) 207-232; the Stoics had genuine reverence for the traditional religion (151); the rites of the oriental cults were usually preserved, but the myths and doctrines Hellenized (166); Rome was built and fortified by the Etruscans (283); all Roman resistance was in vain after Hannibal crossed the Alps, and the Italian confederates deserted the cause (289); Pompey was "leader of the Roman empire" (296); Caesar wanted to unite the Roman empire with the ancient centers of culture in Mesopotamia, Persia, and India as well as Slavic and Germanic peoples in this one commonwealth of nations (300); his assassination put an end to "this magnificent dream of a peaceful, united world" (300-301); his clemency imitated that of

Hellenistic rulers and he desired to model his rule on that of Alexander the Great (367). (One might repeat the witty comment by E. Badian that Caesar seems to have conducted his life knowing that in the future parallel lives would be written about him.) Here Plümacher's irritation with Koester's unpredictable citation of ancient sources is justified.

One might object to his treatment of Antony. Octavius' diabolical manipulation of Antony into a position dependent on Cleopatra and the disastrous Parthian campaign were far more important causes for Antony's demise than any desire to indulge Cleopatra or claims to divine honors (vs. 302-303). (On the divine honors one should now see F. Le Corsu, "Cléopâtre-Isis", *Bulletin Société Française d'Égyptologie* 82 [1978] 22-23). Moreover, Antony should have met Cleopatra when he was with Gabinius in Egypt, 58 BC (when she was 12), later when she was at Rome with Caesar, 46-44 BC, and not for the first time in 41 BC as Koester states (302).

The most serious defect of the book in this reviewer's view is that the limitations on space and the largely synchronic presentation which Koester has chosen for himself fail adequately to present the movement and internal dynamic in the various aspects of Hellenistic life which he treats. For example, one could take the historical part. More attention given to the non-Macedonian elements in Alexander's background, and even to the probability that he was involved in the murder of his father, would help to explain later events. Neither he nor the Macedonians put into motion an amalgamation of Macedonians and Iranians as Koester suggests ("the ill-conceived and unrealistic policy of amalgamation of the Greco-Macedonian and Persian populations", 10). Rather, Alexander ended up with a Macedonian army determined to maintain its privileges, a group of Iranian nobles in a secondary position as courtiers, and a young Iranian army created by Alexander to protect himself from the Macedonians (See A. B. Bosworth "Alexander and the Iranians", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100 [1980] 1-24). After Alexander's death the army, more determined than ever to rule by itself, drew heavily on Greek recruits. However, by the time of the Maccabean revolt the situation had already changed drastically, with native elements — including Jews — forming the bulk of the armies and making their presence felt in the government. (See D. Musti, "L'esercito", in Bandinelli 7, 231-316). By not giving enough attention to this process, and the corresponding creation of *poleis*, including the enormous changes brought by the introduction of the *polis* constitution in Jerusalem, Koester missed an excellent opportunity to illuminate the Maccabean revolt. Following Will he treats the oppression by Antiochos as caused by the disturbances, not vice-versa, and the Zeus Olympios worshiped in the temple as being Zeus-Baal-Shamayim. (If reformulated properly, there is something to be said for the possibility of Antiochos — who for 14 years had been a hostage at Rome — attempting to develop a Greek counterpart to the Roman process of assimilation.) The socio-political struggle which ensued upon the reforms under Antiochos III and IV is better illuminated by E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique* (Nancy 1966-1967), M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (Philadelphia 1974), Peters, Walbank, and for the Roman period — somewhat exaggerated — S. Appelbaum, "The Zealots: The Case for Revaluation", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 91 (1971) 155-170.

This criticism of the largely synchronic approach applies to the scientific and philosophical parts as well. The distinction between the middle and later Plato, and between 4th Cent. Platonism and later Middle Platonism is more or less ignored. The enormous this-worldly and materialistic — in an Einsteinian sense — approach to reality in Hellenistic science, philosophy, and even history, must have had tremendous fascination for “emancipated” Jews of the 2nd Cent. BC, similar to the impact of the European Enlightenment upon Jews of that time. But the immediate precedents of Philo are Neopythagoreanism and the transcendentalism of Eudoros’ commentary on the *Timaios* in Alexandrian Middle Platonism. (See the writings of H. Dörrie, and J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* [London 1977], and now T. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* [Washington DC 1983].) One might ask whether the influence of Judaism in Alexandria did not contribute to later Platonic systems in which God is somehow identified with the Forms, made the highest Being, or is above being. If the reviewer may express an opinion close to home, the treatment of Plutarch does not rescue him from the handbooks.

Koester’s study of literature in the Hellenistic period and Augustan age fails to delineate the distinctive nature of Alexandrian poetry, and its influence on Rome. The great Roman poets are still treated as skillful imitators of the Greeks and as Augustan propagandists.

Treatment of the purely Jewish sections is clear and illuminating. For instance, there is an excellent presentation of the Jewish literature in Alexandria. This review has concentrated on the more purely Greek and Roman sections — in reality only one third of the two volume series — and on points of difference with the author’s viewpoint. Great credit must be given to Koester for his success in presenting the Hellenistic and early Roman period in Greece in a comprehensive, intelligible, and generally sound way, with a view toward Jewish and early Christian culture. The insufficiencies therein — as Plutarch might have said — are due to the vastness of the task, and the limitations of human nature which prevent any one single person from gaining complete mastery over all knowledge.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

F. BRENK, S. J.

Werner H. KELBER, *The Oral and the Written Gospel*. The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q. XVIII-254 p. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press.

Kelber, professor of religious studies at Rice University in Houston, Texas, has been one of the most productive former students of the late Norman Perrin. He is chiefly known for his redaction- and literary-critical works on

Mark, *The Kingdom in Mark* (1974) and *Mark's Story of Jesus* (1979), as well as his contributions to and editing of *The Passion of Mark* (1976). With this new book he breaks fresh ground and refines some of his earlier positions. Here he attempts to transpose his literary insights about Mark's Gospel to the level of linguistic reflection by considering its linguisticity in relation to speaking and writing in the Synoptic tradition, Paul, and Q.

The basic thesis of the book is summarized in the final sentence of the text: "The decisive break in the Synoptic tradition did not thus come, as Bultmann thought, with Easter, but when the written medium took full control, transforming Jesus the speaker of kingdom parables into the parable of the kingdom of God" (p. 220). The five chapters in which this thesis is developed concern the precanonical Synoptic transmission, Mark's oral legacy, Mark as textuality, orality and textuality in Paul, and death and life in the word of God.

Kelber's study is fresh and suggestive. Its freshness arises mainly from his use of research on oral tradition done outside the biblical field. He takes account not only of the pioneering studies by M. Parry and A. B. Lord but also of the more recent findings of anthropologists, psychologists, and linguists. He gives special place to the stimulating ideas of W. J. Ong, who has contributed a two-page foreword. The thrust of this research on oral tradition is that "the circumstances of performance, the composition, and the transmission of oral versus written materials are sufficiently distinct so as to postulate separate hermeneutics" (p. 14).

From this fresh starting point, Kelber proceeds to make some fascinating suggestions, which place the development of the Synoptic tradition in a new light. R. Bultmann's model of evolutionary progression and B. Gerhardsson's model of passive transmission are severely criticized for failing to appreciate orality as a medium in its own right apart from textuality. The traditional materials available to Mark — heroic stories (healings), polarization stories (exorcisms), didactic stories (controversies), and parabolic stories — are shown to follow the rules of oral performance, though Mark's lining up of them entailed a somewhat drastic reconstruction of their oral integrity. Mark the Evangelist, the one who first brought about the freezing of oral life into textual still-life, is described as having maneuvered himself into an outside position vis-à-vis the oral tradition and as estranged from the standard bearers of the oral transmission. Paul, however, appears as fully committed to the oral gospel, as approaching the Old Testament Law in the fashion of an oral traditionalist, and using the letter form to play up his authority in the manner of oral speech. The Markan passion narrative is understood as a text written at some personal and chronological distance from the events described in it; it was part of the Evangelist's radical alternative to the oral gospel represented by Q.

What understanding of Mark's Gospel results from this approach? Mark's Gospel is said to have emerged out of the struggle between orality and textuality. It was composed after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 at the hand of a great innovator in early Christian circles. By portraying Jesus as the parable of the kingdom of God, this innovator sought to explain

in parable form the death of Jesus, the demise of the disciples, and the destruction of Jerusalem.

As I have already said, this is a fresh and suggestive study. However, the clash between orality and textuality as a decisive factor in early Christian development is often pushed too hard to be fully convincing. For example, Kelber makes some interesting points about Paul's polemical stance toward the Law as based on his objection to the objectification of the Law as *gramma*. But he surely goes too far by making this antipathy toward writing into the primary cause of Paul's teaching on this matter. Furthermore, though the first-century A. D. Mediterranean world was far more an oral culture than the modern West is, the prominence of writing and the consequent blurring of orality and textuality cannot be denied. Kelber admits this, but he steadfastly emphasizes the contrasts between oral performance and written text.

The thesis of Mark's Gospel as marking the decisive shift from orality to textuality in early Christianity also allows Kelber to resurrect some unfortunate and much criticized ideas concerning Mark's supposed repudiations of the disciples, the early Christian prophets, and the family of Jesus. These three groups are now presented as the very ones who facilitated and legitimated the oral tradition: the legitimately appointed authorities, the charismatic authorities, and the hereditary authorities. The last group is said to contain Mary the mother of Jesus, who is identified as one of the women of the empty tomb story on the basis of Mark 6,3; 15,40.47; 16,1. By failing to deliver the Easter message (see Mark 16,8), the mother of Jesus along with Mary Magdalene and Salome have supposedly been portrayed as instrumental in the final and decisive breakdown of the oral transmission. These unusual interpretations had already been raised elsewhere by Kelber and a few other scholars; now they are set forth in a new framework but in a still unconvincing way.

In summary, Kelber has produced a very challenging work, more suggestive than probative. He has brought to biblical scholarship the results of recent research on oral tradition. He has given some good and fresh suggestions about the development of early Christianity and highlighted Mark's achievement in moving from orality to textuality. The faults of his work stem mainly from pushing a good idea too hard.

Weston School of Theology
3 Phillips Place
Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

Daniel J. HARRINGTON

William R. FARMER, *Jesus and the Gospel, Tradition, Scripture and Canon*. Philadelphia 1982. Fortress Press. \$ 21.95.

William Farmer is well known for his pronounced opinions on the Synoptic problem. In this his latest book he goes far beyond the question of the

interrelationship between Matt, Mark and Luke and endeavours to explain how the words of Jesus and the stories about his activity were collected, transmitted and transformed in the primitive Church, until, under various historical circumstances, they became, first Gospel, and then Gospels, and how these Gospels later became canonical Scripture due to further ecclesiastical requirements. Much space is devoted to his favourite thesis on the priority of Matthew and the secondary character of Mark. This is established in a thirty-page introduction, which is followed by the first part of the book: The origin and development of the Gospel tradition, the second part: From the Gospel tradition to the Gospel genre, and the third: The development of the New Testament Canon.

Part One is introduced by a good short chapter on the historical setting of Jesus' public ministry followed by the main chapter on Jesus and the Gospel tradition. For a conservative scholar like Farmer this chapter is a little minimalistic. Apart from certain questionable statements about Jesus' having been a disciple of John (p. 34) or about his expectation of an imminent judgement (p. 32), what seems to the author as having been the original doctrine of Jesus is set down regardless of various opinions, proposed criteria of authenticity and the ensuing controversies and serious insights on the nature of the Kingdom of God. Farmer's selection accentuates those points which were later developed by Paul. The modifications of the Jesus traditions during the period of transmission are attributed mainly to the influence of Christian prophets, Christian scribes — a useful contribution — and *chreiai*, on which too much emphasis is laid. The origin of legends and myths is also studied. Their theological function is well brought out though the reader may remain with the idea that there is scarcely anything behind them. The first part of the book ends with a discussion about the influence of the war of A.D. 66-70 on the Jesus tradition.

In the second part of the book, dealing with the formation of the Gospels proper, Farmer marshals all the arguments possible, taken from E. P. Sanders, F. P. Badham and Pierson Parker, to prove that Mark is secondary in relation to Matthew (pp. 111-134). Luke depends on Matthew as regards the material they have in common, and is the second Gospel. Mark is a shortening and harmonizing of both. As this is not a book on the Synoptic problem specifically one cannot expect the author to go into detail about what scholars usually call the Q-material, but hardly anything is said to explain Q, M and L. Of all the arguments which are meant to prove the secondary character of Mark to Matt very few make their point, and those that do fall to the ground if some sort of Urmarkus common to both Matt and Mark is presupposed, as is done by most scholars who have written lately on the Synoptic problem. Nor is any attempt made to explain why Mark omitted the sayings of Jesus contained in Matt and Luke. All we get is: "To explain why an author has omitted items from sources available to him is very precarious. Sometimes the reason for omission is clear, but often it is obscure. All we can say is that it is characteristic of authors who are working with closely related sources by different authors to produce works which are often shorter than the sources used" (p. 165). On pp. 113-117 Farmer had used Badham's list of passages in which Mark is longer than Matt as a

proof that they are later glosses. So which way does the argument go? Moreover, as the omissions of Mark from Matt and Luke are so important, valid and convincing reasons must be presented, based on the specific character of Mark's audience and the evangelist's purposes, to account for such great differences. Nor is anything said about the many places where Matt's Greek is better than Mark's. On the two-document hypothesis Matt corrects Mark, but why should Mark corrupt Matt?

The origin of Matthew's Gospel is placed in post-war Syria, more precisely in Antioch, where Christians of the Jewish tradition took a pro-Roman stance after the destruction of Jerusalem and orientated themselves towards the mission to the gentiles. As Matthew is the first Gospel Farmer has to explain the origin of the gospel genre. The author says nothing of the structure of Matt, of the difference in genre between, say, epistle and gospel, of the necessity of anchoring faith in history against Gnostic tendencies, as Käsemann had done with Mark. Palmer explains the contents of Matt (or the *school* of Matt) with reference to Isa (9,1-2), to justify Jesus' activity in Galilee and Isa 53 to warrant the healings of Jesus and his martyrdom; he recognizes the influence of Hellenistic rhetoric on the presentation of the person of Christ; he stresses the wisdom motif to explain the importance of the Sermon on the Mount; he places a stress on the Son of God Christology which was developing among the gentiles, and on the passion motif. These were Matt's presuppositions in his interpretation of the tradition concerning Jesus, and that is how the Gospel arose. Would it not have been simpler to assume that Matt found an already existing genre and structure in Mark, to which he added scriptural references as a comment, and into which he inserted his discourse material in five "books" on the pattern of the Pentateuch, as is generally asserted?

Jesus and the Gospel is a book well worth reading because it contains many precious insights. It is not clear for which reading public it is intended as it varies from sweeping statements to detailed descriptions and analyses, but on the whole, a reader who retains the two-document hypothesis in any of its various formulations, in spite of its defects, will remain rather unconvinced by Farmer's thesis.

Via del Sant'Uffizio, 25
00193 Rome

Prosper GRECH, OSA

Josef KÜRZINGER, *Papias von Hierapolis und die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments*. Eichstätter Materialien 4 (Philosophie und Theologie). 250 p. Regensburg 1983. Verlag Friedrich Pustet.

This book consists of four articles by the author, already published in *BZ NF* 4 (1960) 19-38; *NTS* 10 (1963/4) 108-115; *BZ NF* 21 (1977) 245-264 and *BZ NF* 23 (1979) 172-186 (pp. 1-88), of all the Papias fragments in a

good text-critical edition with notes and German translation (pp. 89-138) and of an annotated bibliography from 1960 to 1981 (pp. 139-229) plus 30 pages of indexes.

On the utility of the second and third parts it is unnecessary to pass any comment. The four articles in the first part, however, although spanning a period of almost twenty years, form an organic whole and present an original interpretation — already well known — of Papias' testimony on the Gospels of Mark and Matthew (Eusebius, *H.E.* III 39,14-16), which we shall summarize and comment.

When Eusebius reports Papias' testimony about Mark and Matt he inserts a comment of his own between the two, making two separate paragraphs out of what should have been one, contrasting Matt to Mark. Hence, commentators on Papias usually interpreted the Matt testimony to mean that Matt wrote the *logia* (either sayings only or sayings and deeds) of Jesus in Hebrew or Aramaic, and that various people made different translations of these *logia* into Greek.

If we read the two texts in one breath, however, the testimony on Matt should be read in the light of the one on Mark. About Mark, Kürzinger renders Papias' phrase that Mark was Peter's *hermēneuēs* as meaning that he was the apostle's "spokesman" rather than "translator". His Gospel consisted of those things which he had himself remembered — the aorist *emnēmōneusen* gives the idea of globality. *Ou méntoi táxei: táxis* does not mean "order" as it is usually rendered, but is a Greek rhetorical term which Kürzinger renders "literarische Komposition". Papias is defending Mark, probably against some readers in Hierapolis who found Mark's Gospel too uncouth as literature. He explains that Mark wrote, as Peter had preached, in the form of *chreiai*, another rhetorical term denoting stories about and short sayings of famous men, rather like *apophthegmata*. Of such *chreiai* was Mark's Gospel composed. The reader should not mind the form as much as the content of the Gospel, for Mark was only concerned with not leaving out anything of what he had heard from Peter on things said and done by Jesus: *tà hypò toũ kyriou ē lechthénta ē prachthénta*.

Matthew, on the other hand, wrote *hebraïdi dialéktō*. This *can* mean "in the Hebrew language" but it can also mean "in a style adapted for Jewish readers (even if Greek-speaking)"; and, in contrast to Mark who wrote without *táxis*, Matt *tà lógia synetáxato*, i.e. gave the *logia*, which according to Kürzinger include both sayings and deeds, a definite literary structure common among the Jews of the diaspora.

The phrase *hermēneusen d'autà hōs hēn dunatōs hékastos*, according to our author, does not mean "and each one translated these *logia* written in Hebrew as he could", but *hékastos* stands, as it very well can stand in Hellenistic Greek, for *hekáteros*. This would mean that *both* Matt and Mark exposed the *logia* of (or about) Jesus as each one could. There would be no objection, therefore, to the supposition that Matt was originally written in Greek for Greek-speaking diaspora Jewish-Christians. The difference between Matt and Mark consists only in the fact that while Mark wrote *chreiai* without any *táxis*, Matt gave Jesus' *lógia* a Jewish *syntaxis*.

Kürzinger's interpretation of Papias is most attractive, and I can find no

single argument to deny that it can be true; whether it has more weight on the scales of probability is another matter. First of all it is not at all certain that Papias' testimony originally consisted of one paragraph contrasting or comparing Matt to Mark. Eusebius might have been right in separating the two. That the last phrase on Mt *hermēneusen d'autà hōs hēn dynatōs hēkas-tos* refers not to Matt's translators but to Matt's and Mark's interpretation of Jesus' logia is not probable because the sentence is closely linked: *Matthaios mēn hermēneusen de*, hence the last phrase refers to the assertion on Matt and his translators. That *dialēktos* does not here mean language but style is also not probable, especially if the complementary clause speaks of translations. Therefore the scales of probability weigh against the author's interpretation of Papias' text on Matt.

Kürzinger's investigation on the Gospel of Mark is more positive. His main contribution, which should be taken seriously, is the identification of the terms *chreia* and *táxis* as rhetorical terms even in this context, and seen in this light, the opposition of Mark to Matt makes sense: one wrote *chreiai* without *táxis*, the other composed a writing in Hebrew with *syntaxis*. Was Papias capable of such a judgement? Eusebius does not think highly of his intelligence (H.E. III, 39,13), but this might refer to Papias' credulity rather than to his literary knowledge.

The identification of *chreia* as a rhetorical term in Papias leads to a further contribution to the contemporary discussion about the literary genre "Gospel" and its related forms in antiquity. Kürzinger brings out the similarities between *chreia*, *apophthegma* and *apomnemoneuma* (Justin describes the Gospels as *apomnemoneumata tōn apostólōn* in *Apol. I*, 67,3) in Hellenistic literature. If Papias uses this generic term to describe the totality of Mark we can say that the Gospels not only *contain* *chreiai*, they *are* *chreiai* or collections of such.

Kürzinger's book is bound to reopen the Papias question and should be read by both biblical and patristic scholars as an invaluable *instrumentum laboris*.

Via del Sant'Uffizio, 25
00193 Rome

Prosper GRECH, OSA

D. PATTE, *Paul's Faith and the Power of the Gospel. A Structural Introduction to the Pauline Letters*. xxiv-408 p. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press.

D. Patte se propose d'introduire à la lecture des épîtres pauliniennes. Cette entreprise pédagogique n'aurait pas requis de recension en cette revue, si elle n'était soutenue par une épistémologie qui mérite l'attention des spécialistes.

L'A. veut présenter la *foi* de l'apôtre, qu'il distingue de sa *théologie* (xviii, 10s, 190). La foi est à la théologie ce que les convictions sont aux idées: nous pouvons manipuler les idées, alors que les convictions ont pouvoir sur nous, nous font vivre et nous transcendent (12); les convictions peuvent rester stables, tandis que les idées qui les expriment peuvent changer: nous partageons les mêmes convictions, la même foi en J.-C. que les premières générations chrétiennes, et pourtant les représentations, catégories et argumentations théologiques ont varié dans l'espace et le temps, au long des siècles et selon les cultures (90s). Présenter la foi de Paul, c'est donc, pour Patte, au delà des concepts, aller jusqu'aux principes fondamentaux qui en déterminent l'usage (91), en bref, c'est exprimer la façon dont Paul voit la relation du croyant à Dieu (127) et par conséquent aux autres.

Mais, comment, dans les épîtres, distinguer les convictions des idées? Le peut-on même? L'A. reconnaît lui-même qu'il est difficile de différencier concepts et convictions: Paul exprime parfois sa théologie au moyen de termes et de phrases qu'à d'autres moments il utilise pour exprimer sa foi (201; également 193). Mais, sur quels critères décider qu'un même terme est théologoumène en tel passage et pas en tel autre ou, par exemple, que le Christ est au centre de la théologie paulinienne et pas au centre de sa foi (xiii, 136, 150, 191)?

En étudiant d'abord les caractéristiques d'un système de convictions, la façon dont il fonctionne et fait vivre (pour ce faire, Patte utilise avec brio l'exemple de l'amour homme/femme); il y a des systèmes statiques, où les convictions sont définitives et totalement arrêtées, sans changement possible, et des systèmes dynamiques, ouverts, capables d'intégrer de nouvelles révélations. Cela même permet de distinguer le système de convictions du judaïsme pharisaïque (statique: la révélation a été entièrement donnée avec la torah; l'histoire sacrée est close; le croyant doit se rendre lui-même contemporain des événements salvifiques originaires, aller à eux en quelque sorte; cf. tout le ch. 3) et celui de Paul (dynamique: la révélation de Dieu se fait continuellement, dans les événements et à travers autrui; loin de clore la série des révélations, la venue du Christ l'a au contraire ouverte; le croyant n'a pas à se tourner vers l'événement de la croix pour s'en rendre contemporain: toute sa vie est reproduction originale du mystère de la passion du Christ).

Dans le reste du livre (ch. 4 à 8), l'A. se propose de montrer que, pour Paul, la foi est d'abord centrée sur l'expérience du chrétien et non sur Jésus: «si les Thessaloniciens sont dans une relation juste avec Dieu, ce n'est pas à cause de ce qui est arrivé à Jésus ou de ce qu'il a fait, bien plutôt à cause de ce qui a surgi dans leur propre expérience... Jésus n'est pas la révélation complète et finale de leur élection» (137; même chose en 149s, 156, cette fois dit à propos de Phil). Ce que veut dire l'A. est clair: la foi du chrétien se définit d'abord à partir de l'expérience du pardon accordé gracieusement par Dieu et des dons spirituels expérimentés par la communauté; le recours aux événements passés est second, il est justification, lecture d'une cohérence du dessein divin, mais il ne remplace pas l'expérience, où se vit la foi.

La faille du discours de Patte vient de cette façon de lire les lettres pauliniennes. A vouloir laisser Jésus-Christ dans le passé, on en oublie Rm 8,9.10 (Christ en nous) et Ga 2,20 («ce n'est plus moi qui vis, c'est le Christ

qui vit en moi»); la formule, qui revient tant de fois sous la plume de Paul, «en Christ» et les mentions de la foi en Christ ne sont pas davantage analysées. Pas une seule fois il n'est question d'union avec le ressuscité — si, à la p. 303, mais c'est à propos de l'erreur des Corinthiens. Si le Christ n'est pas le cœur de la foi des chrétiens, c'est-à-dire leur vie même, si l'Esprit reçu n'est pas celui du Christ, alors comment pouvons-nous dire «Abba» (Rm 8)? Le Christ est au centre de l'expérience de *foi* et pas seulement au centre de la théologie paulinienne.

Il est vrai que la distinction entre les convictions et leur expression théologique va permettre de trancher entre ceux qui pensent que la théologie de l'apôtre insiste sur l'histoire du salut et ceux pour qui sa pensée a pour centre la doctrine de la justification. Selon Patte, ce qui a trait à la justification, donc à l'expérience du croyant, ressortit à la foi, alors que l'argumentation théologique paulinienne utilise beaucoup les étapes de l'histoire du salut. Admettons. J'ai pourtant du mal à accepter que la dimension historique (narrative, comme on dit aujourd'hui) n'appartienne qu'à l'argumentation théologique: croire, c'est recevoir un passé, le passé des croyants qui nous ont précédés, comme grâce; comment la vie personnelle de foi pourrait-elle oublier ce passé, sans lequel il n'y a pas de prière de louange (et la louange est l'expression parfaite de la foi)?

Plus globalement, si l'on peut distinguer assez facilement les convictions et les idées dans un ouvrage scientifique (lorsque, par ex., un spécialiste, à partir d'une description rigoureuse des processus cérébraux va chercher à montrer — s'il est matérialiste — que la pensée n'est rien d'autre que ces processus, ou — s'il est spiritualiste — qu'elle est tout autre chose que cela), il n'en est pas de même lorsqu'on cherche à dire sa foi: les représentations sont alors inséparables des convictions, les colorent et en font partie intégrante. L'affinement des représentations est déterminant pour la foi et vice versa. Le discours religieux (expression des convictions et de leurs justifications) est précisément celui où la distinction utilisée par Patte est la moins opérante. Au demeurant, tout au long de la présentation qu'il fait des épîtres pauliniennes aucun critère *formel* (il y en a pourtant) n'est proposé pour déterminer si les termes ont fonction de conviction ou de représentation.

Ceci dit, l'ouvrage ne manque pas de qualités, même si son rythme est trop lent — mais les premiers destinataires n'en sont pas les spécialistes! Pour finir, signalons un point intéressant et important: les métonymies de Ga 3,13 (le Christ devenu malédiction pour nous) et 2 Co 5,21 (devenu péché). Selon l'interprétation commune de ces passages, la colère vindicative de Dieu serait tombée sur Jésus. Expiation vicarie, en somme. Patte montre que ces formules renvoient à l'interprétation des juifs, qui refusaient de croire qu'en Jésus la bénédiction eschatologique nous soit donnée: Paul reprend les mots-clés de leur objections (malédiction, péché), pour insister sur le renversement opéré en notre faveur, grâce à Jésus (285, 307ss).

Vincenzo SCIPPA, *La glossolalia nel Nuovo Testamento*. Ricerca esegetica secondo il metodo storico-critico e analitico-strutturale (Biblioteca Teologica Napoletana) M. D'Auria Ed. xvi-330 p. 24 x 16,5. Napoli 1982.

Réalité redevenue actuelle après des siècles de latence, la glossolalie est un sujet à l'ordre du jour. Dans sa thèse de doctorat V. Scippa l'étudie du point de vue exégétique. Il examine tous les textes du NT qui témoignent de cette manifestation charismatique (1 Co 12-14; Ac 2,1-21; 10,44-47; 19,6-8; Mc 16,17) et il leur ajoute Ac 4,31. De ces textes, il présente une étude très détaillée et méthodique, qui les situe dans leur contexte, les soumet à une analyse grammaticale, sémantique, structurelle et littéraire, s'efforce de distinguer leurs sources et d'apprécier leurs perspectives rédactionnelles. Les rapports avec l'AT font aussi l'objet d'un examen approfondi. Avant de résumer ses résultats dans le dernier chapitre, V. Scippa compare, dans l'avant-dernier chapitre, la glossolalie de notre époque à celle dont parle le NT et il note, à leur sujet, divergences et convergences. L'ouvrage ne manque donc pas d'intérêt. Pour les exégètes de métier, il présente l'inconvénient d'être trop long et de s'attarder à de multiples détails élémentaires, comme l'analyse minutieuse des formes grammaticales même les plus simples. Il est plutôt conçu pour des débutants, qui désirent s'initier aux différentes démarches du travail exégétique. Pour eux, l'abondance des détails a son utilité et les nombreux schémas ou tableaux synoptiques constituent une aide excellente.

V. Scippa a la sagesse de ne pas prétendre à des conclusions définitives sur tous les points discutés. De fait, à côté de démonstration convaincantes, on trouve dans sa thèse des affirmations contestables. Parmi les diverses expressions que le NT emploie pour parler de glossolalie, V.S. estime que «la formule primitive et la plus commune» est celle qui met «langue» au singulier: «parler par langue». On le suivra difficilement sur ce point, car le pluriel est en réalité plus fréquent et s'emploie même lorsque le sujet du verbe est au singulier, alors qu'on n'a jamais «langue» au singulier lorsque le verbe est au pluriel. Mieux venue est l'analyse de critique littéraire et rédactionnelle des textes des Actes. En Ac 2 V.S. discerne, en plus du catalogue des nations, deux sources du récit de la Pentecôte; l'une présentait l'événement comme un parler en langues analogue à celui que pratiquèrent les Corinthiens, c'est-à-dire une louange de Dieu avec des mots incompréhensibles; l'autre source, au contraire, affirmait que les auditeurs pouvaient comprendre. Luc a unifié son récit dans cette seconde perspective et il a mis dans la même lumière un autre épisode de glossolalie (Ac 10,44-47) qui primitivement était du premier genre. V.S. estime que Luc n'a pas réinterprété dans le même sens la glossolalie paulinienne d'Ac 19,6, mais cette opinion est discutable, car Luc attribue aux néophytes de 19,6 un parler en langues uni à l'action de prophétiser, ce qui, dans son vocabulaire, indique une glossolalie intelligible.

Au sujet de Mc 16,17 V.S. pense que l'expression marcienne «parler en langues nouvelles» dépend littérairement de l'expression lucanienne «parler en d'autres langues» (Ac 2,4), qu'elle chercherait à clarifier. V.S. en conclut que l'expression marcienne doit s'entendre de «parlers compréhensibles et clairs». Ce dernier point n'est aucunement évident, car, comparé à *heterais*, qui s'ap-

plique sans difficulté à des langues étrangères, l'adjectif *kainais* favorise plutôt l'autre sens possible, celui de langues nouvellement créées, comme le «nom nouveau» de l'Apocalypse, «que nul ne connaît hormis celui qui le reçoit» (Ap 2,17).

Sur l'utilité attribuée à la glossolalie en 1 Co 12-14, V.S. s'exprime de manière confuse, car il accepte sans problèmes la traduction courante du *pros to sympheron* de 1 Co 12,7 et affirme donc que tous les charismes, y compris la glossolalie, sont «manifestation particulière de l'Esprit pour l'utilité commune» (p. 72). En réalité, cette traduction ajoute au texte grec, qui dit seulement «pour l'utilité» (comparer Mt 5,29-30), et l'explication donnée en 1 Co 14,4 montre que, selon Paul, la glossolalie n'a qu'une utilité personnelle et non communautaire: «Celui qui parle en langue s'édifie lui-même, tandis que celui qui prophétise édifie la communauté assemblée».

Une autre position confuse concerne la définition de la glossolalie. V.S. constate à juste titre l'impossibilité d'unifier les diverses descriptions de ce charisme données par le NT. Le «parler en d'autres langues» d'Ac 2 se différencie nettement du «parler en langues» de 1 Cor 14. Néanmoins V.S. se refuse à distinguer deux espèces de glossolalie et affirme fortement «l'unicité du charisme biblique» (p. 199), au point d'en tirer argument contre la glossolalie moderne. Le fait que celle-ci ne ressemble, en règle générale, qu'à la glossolalie de 1 Co 14 et non à celle d'Ac 2 constitue, selon V.S., un «point de divergence» d'avec «la» glossolalie néotestamentaire. C'est là, me semble-t-il, une étrange façon de raisonner.

Un autre point de divergence consisterait dans le caractère non extatique de la glossolalie moderne, qui l'opposerait au caractère extatique de la glossolalie néotestamentaire. Ce qui empêche ici la discussion d'être concluante, c'est le manque de précision sur le sens donné au mot «extatique». Les textes du NT n'exigent nullement que les glossolales soient en extase, complètement coupés du monde ambiant. En leur donnant des prescriptions à observer, Paul manifeste clairement le contraire. S'il avait considéré la glossolalie comme une irruption irrépressible de l'Esprit, aurait-il pu prescrire qu'en l'absence d'interprète, le glossolale doit se taire (1 Co 14,28)? La glossolalie corinthienne apparaît plutôt comme une impulsion qui supprimait certaines inhibitions et conduisait à un comportement surprenant (prier Dieu en inventant des mots sans se soucier de faire un discours intelligible); en ce sens restreint, elle était «extatique». La glossolalie moderne est exactement du même genre, si on en juge d'après de multiples témoignages. Elle est «extatique» en ce sens restreint; elle n'est pas extatique au sens plus fort d'une perte de conscience par rapport au monde extérieur. Mais bien des degrés sont possibles dans l'irrationnel et dans l'inspiration. Il y a donc place pour de longues discussions.

En tout état de cause, l'ouvrage de V. Scippa a le double mérite d'offrir une initiation à plusieurs méthodes exégétiques et de stimuler la réflexion sur une réalité vivante.

Institut Biblique Pontifical
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Albert VANHOYE S. J.

Francis A. SULLIVAN, S. J., *Charisms and Charismatic Renewal. A Biblical and Theological Study*. 184 p. 20,3 × 13,3. Ann Arbor, Michigan 1982. Servant Books.

Bien qu'il ne se présente pas comme un ouvrage d'exégèse, ce livre mérite de retenir l'attention des exégètes, car il donne des explications lumineuses de plus d'un texte difficile et il éclaire l'un par l'autre l'Écriture et la vie de l'Église. Ses neuf chapitres, écrits en une langue simple, claire et précise, étudient l'enseignement de l'apôtre Paul sur les divers charismes et confrontent avec cet enseignement l'expérience vivante du mouvement «pentecôtiste» et du «renouveau charismatique». L'auteur manifeste à la fois une grande pénétration doctrinale dans l'analyse des textes et un admirable sens spirituel et pastoral dans l'appréciation des faits.

Pour commenter les textes de Paul, il utilise des traductions existantes, mais il a soin de noter les points où elles s'écartent du grec, lorsqu'elles disent, par exemple, «for the *common good*» là où le grec a simplement «with a view to what is profitable» (1 Co 12,7), ou lorsqu'elles parlent de «workers of miracles» et «healers» là où le grec ne met aucun titre de personnes (1 Co 12,28). Le commentaire est toujours sobre et judicieux. Les problèmes sont exposés avec précision et les solutions proposées sont en général convaincantes. On peut noter, toutefois, un certain manque de cohérence entre l'excellent commentaire du *pros to symphéron* de 1 Co 12,7 (p. 30) et les définitions générales des charismes données pp. 19 et 29. A propos de 1 Co 12,7 l'auteur observe, à juste titre, que la glossolalie, selon Paul, ne sert pas «au bien commun», mais n'est profitable qu'au glossolale lui-même (1 Co 14,4). Comment peut-on dire alors que tous les charismes sont en rapport avec des ministères et qu'ils déterminent la fonction de chacun dans le corps ecclésial? La glossolalie est un charisme, mais n'a pas de rapport spécifique avec un ministère particulier. Il y a donc lieu de mettre une distinction plus nette entre charismes et ministères.

L'auteur étudie successivement le «baptême dans l'Esprit», le charisme de prophétie, la glossolalie et les dons de guérisons. Sur tous ces points, son exposé est excellent, à la fois équilibré et stimulant pour la pensée et pour la vie de l'Église. Il apporte d'autre part des informations sur l'origine et le développement du renouveau charismatique. La confrontation entre l'expérience récente et les données du NT manifeste une remarquable convergence. Mais l'auteur montre aussi, à l'occasion, que les siècles qui nous ont précédés n'ont pas manqué de dons charismatiques; l'absence de l'expression ne signifiait pas l'absence de la réalité.

On s'étonne un peu de ne pas trouver à la fin de l'ouvrage une conclusion générale. Cette omission a son bon côté: elle incite à penser que le livre n'a pas voulu exposer et régler un problème, mais plutôt présenter une réalité en plein développement.

Institut Biblique Pontifical
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Albert VANHOYE S. J.

NUNTII PERSONARUM



R. I. P.

R. P. Ernst VOGT, S. I., die 28 februarii 1984 Romae e vita discessit, annos natus 81. Alumnus Instituti fuit 1934–1938 (S.S.D.) et professor exegeos V.T. in Facultate Biblica apud Pontificium Institutum Biblicum inde ab anno 1948, rector Instituti per 14 annos (1949–1963).

R. P. Viliam PAVLOVSKÝ, S. I., die 13 martii 1984 Romae e vita discessit, annos natus 72. Alumnus Instituti fuit 1947–1949 (S.S.D.), professor linguarum orientalium antiquarum et historiae biblicae apud Pontificium Institutum Biblicum inde ab anno 1954.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

An dieser Stelle werden die für *Biblica* eingesandten Bücher verzeichnet. Eine Beurteilung ist damit nicht gegeben. Werke, die von der Redaktion nicht ausdrücklich erbeten worden sind, werden nicht zurückgesandt, auch wenn ihnen eine weitere Besprechung nicht zuteil werden kann.

Eingesandte Bücher und Artikel gehen an den Redaktor des *Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus* zur Anzeige nach dessen Gutbefinden.

Die Anschrift, an die wir die Sendungen zu richten bitten, ist: Schriftleitung *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italien.

Vetus Testamentum

Berlin, Adele, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Bible and Literature Series 9). 180 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1983. The Almond Press. US \$10.95.

Beuken, W. A. M., *Jesaja deel II B* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament). 365 p. 23,1 × 15. Nijkerk 1983. G. F. Callenbach. Gld. 77,50.

Campbell, E. F. – **Freedman, D. N.** (Editors), *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader IV*. XIII-390 p. 41 Illustrations. 19,8 × 12,6. Sheffield 1983. The Almond Press. US \$9.95.

Cazeaux, Jacques, *La trame et la chaîne ou les Structures littéraires et l'Exégèse dans cinq des Traités de Philon d'Alexandrie* (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 15). 620 p. 24,5 × 16,3. Leiden 1983. E. J. Brill.

Conroy, Charles, *1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Kings with an Excursus on Davidic Dynasty and Holy City Zion* (Old Testament Message 6). 266 p. 21 × 13,3. Wilmington DL 1983. US \$8.95.

Crenshaw, James L. (Ed.), *Theodicy in the Old Testament* (Issues and Theology 4). 163 p. 21,6 × 13,3. Philadelphia – London 1983. Fortress Press – SPCK. US \$3.50.

Freedman, D. N. – **Graf, D. F.**, *Palestine in Transition*. The Emergence of Ancient Israel (The Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series 2). 108 p. 23,3 × 15,2. Sheffield 1983. The Almond Press. US \$9.95.

Friedman, Richard Elliott (Ed.), *The Poet and the Historian*. Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism (Harvard Semitic Studies 26). 163 p. 23,5 × 15,7. Chico, CA 1983. Scholars Press. US \$13.00.

Galbiati, E. R. – Aletti, A., *Atlante Storico della Bibbia e dell'Antico Oriente*. Dalla preistoria alla caduta di Gerusalemme nell'anno 70 d.C. 255 p. 34,5×25. Milano 1983. Massimo – Jaca Book.

Goldstein, Jonathan A., *II Maccabees*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (The Anchor Bible 41A). 595 p. 24×16. New York, N.Y. Doubleday. US \$18.00.

Guillén Torralba, Juan, *La fuerza oculta de Dios*. La Elección en el Antiguo Testamento (Institución San Jeronimo 15). 455 p. 24×16,2. Valencia – Cordoba 1983. Publicaciones del Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Cordoba.

Hebrew Union College Annual, Volume LIII. Matitiah Tsevat, Editor. Index of Authors to Hebrew Union College Annual Volumes I through LIII. 408 p. 23,4×15,5. Cincinnati 1970. Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institute of Religion. US \$20.00.

Lang, Bernhard, *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority*. An Essay in Biblical History and Sociology (The Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series 1). 191 p. 21,5×13,4. Sheffield 1983. The Almond Press. US \$22.95.

L'Heureux, Conrad E., *In and Out of Paradise*. The Book of Genesis from Adam and Eve to the Tower of Babel. 92 p. 20,3×13,6. New York – Ramsey 1983. Paulist Press. US \$3.95.

MacKenzie, R. A. F., *Sirach* (Old Testament Message 19). 196 p. 21×13,3. Wilmington DL 1983.

Meyer, Lester, *The Message of Exodus*. A Theological Commentary. 171 p. 19,6×13,3. Minneapolis MN 1983. Augsburg.

Núñez Carreira, José, *Camoës e Antigo Testamento*. 146 p. 23×16,2. Açores 1982. Ponta Delgada.

Reviv, Hanoch, *The Elders in Ancient Israel*. A Study of a Biblical Institution. 193 p. 23×16. Jerusalem 1983. The Magnes Press – The Hebrew University. US \$15.00.

Sanders, Jack T., *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom* (SBL Monograph Series 28). x-123 p. 22,8×15. Chico CA 1983. Scholars Press. US \$19.50.

Savoca, Gaetano (et alii), *I Canti di Sion*. Traduzione interlineare dei salmi ebraici. 259 p. 19,7×13. Messina 1983. Editore A. Ippolito.

Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum, auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum. Vol. VIII, 5: Tobit. Edidit Robert Hanhart. 185 p. 23,7×16. Göttingen 1983. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Trapiello, J. Garcia, *Il problema morale nell'Antico Testamento*. Traduzione di P. Raimondo Sorgia. 214 p. 19,9×13,1. Milano 1983. Editrice Massimo. Lit. 10.000.

van der Wal, Adri, *Amos. A Classified Bibliography*. 186 p. 20,3 × 14,5. Amsterdam 1983. Free University Press. FL 29,50.

van Selms, A., *Job II (De Prediking van het Oude Testament)*. 256 p. 23,1 × 15. Nijkerk 1983. G. F. Callenbach. Gld. 61,50.

Novum Testamentum

Beskow, Per, *Strange Tales About Jesus. A Survey of Unfamiliar Gospels*. VIII-135 p. 20,5 × 14. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press. US \$6.95.

Brown, Raymond E., *Antioch and Rome. New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*. XII-242 p. New York - Ramsey 1983. US \$9.95.

Carrez, M., (et alii), *Les lettres de Paul, de Jacques, Pierre et Jude* (Petite Bibliothèque des Sciences Bibliques, Nouveau Testament 3). 332 p. 20,5 × 13,3. Paris 1983. Desclée. FF 125.

Farmer, W. R. - Farkasfalvy, D. M., *The Formation of the New Testament Canon. An Ecumenical Approach (Theological Inquiries)*. IX-182 p. 20,3 × 13,6. New York - Ramsey - Toronto 1983. Paulist Press. US \$7.95.

Glöckner, Richard, *Neutestamentliche Wundergeschichten und das Lob der Wundertaten Gottes in den Psalmen* (Walberberger Studien 13). 215 p. 25 × 14,5. Mainz 1983. Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag.

Kee, Howard Clark, *Miracle in the Early Christian World. A Study in Sociohistorical Method*. 320 p. 21,7 × 14,3. New Haven - London 1983. Yale University Press. £20,00.

Kilpatrick, G. D., *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy* (The Moorhouse Lectures 1975) VII-115 p. 22,2 × 14,2. Cambridge 1984. Cambridge University Press. US \$27.50.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean, *The Christology of Mark's Gospel*. XVII-203 p. 23,3 × 14,7. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press.

Kirchschläger, Walter, *Die Paulusbriefe Vorge stellt* (Reihe b 5). 88 p. 18,7 × 11,6. Klosterneuburg 1983. DM 13.

Lapide, Pinchas, *The Resurrection of Jesus. A Jewish Perspective*. 160 p. 19,7 × 13,4. Minneapolis, MN 1983. Augsburg. US \$8.95.

Leenhardt, Franz J., *La mort et le testament de Jésus* (Essais bibliques 6). 145 p. 21 × 14,9. Genève 1983. Labor et Fides.

Pereire, Francis, *Ephesus: Climax of Universalism in Luke-Acts. A Redaction-Critical Study of Paul's Ephesian Ministry (Acts 18:23-20:1)* (Jesuit Theological Forum Studies 1). XVI-304 p. 21,1 × 14,1. Anand, India 1983. Gujarat Sahitya Prakash.

Räisänen, Heikki, *Paul and the Law* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 29). x-320 p. 23,6 × 16. Tübingen 1983. J. C. B. Mohr.

Robinson, James M., *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus and Other Essays*. 216 p. 21,6 × 14. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press. US \$11.95.

Romaniuk, bp Kazimierz, *Soteriologia św Pawła*. 318 p. 24,5 × 17,5. Warszawa 1983. Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.

Smith, Robert H., *Easter Gospels*. The Resurrection of Jesus According to the Four Evangelists. 254 p. 21,2 × 14,5. Minneapolis, MN 1983. Augsburg.

Stanton, Graham (Ed.), *The Interpretation of Matthew* (Issues in Religion and Theology 3). 164 p. 21,6 × 13,3. Philadelphia - London 1983. Fortress Press - SPCK. US \$3.50.

Stock, Klemens, *Jesus — die Frohe Botschaft*. Meditationen zu Markus. 168 S. 20,5 × 12,9. Innsbruck - Wien 1983. Tyrolia Verlag. DM 24.

Tuckett, Christopher (Ed.), *The Messianic Secret* (Issues in Religion and Theology 1). 148 p. 21,6 × 13,3. Philadelphia - London 1983. Fortress Press - SPCK. US \$3.50.

Vetus Latina, Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel. Nach Petrus Sabatier Neu Gesammelt und Herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron. 25 (Pars II). Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos, Herausgegeben von Hermann Josef Frede. 2. Lieferung. Tt 3,5 bis Schluß Phlm mit Vorbemerkung. p. 921-996. 31,7 × 24. Freiburg 1983. Herder.

Varia

Amusin, I. D., *Kumranskaya obščina, The Qumran Community* (in Russian). 328 p. 14,5 × 22. Moskva 1983. Nauka.

Bibbia, Catalogo di Edizioni a Stampa 1501-1957 (Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo Unico delle Biblioteche Italiane e per le Informazioni Bibliografiche). xii-349 p. 24,7 × 34. Roma 1983.

Biondi, Alessandro, *Gli Accenti nei Papiri Greci Biblici* (Papyrologica Castroctaviana 9). xii-84 p. 20,7 × 16,1. Roma - Barcelona 1983. Papyrologica Castroctaviana. Lit. 19.000.

Collado, V. - Zurro, E., (Edd.), *El Misterio de la Palabra*. Homenaje de sus alumnos al profesor D. Luis Alonso Schökel al cumplir veinticinco años de magisterio en el Instituto Biblico Pontificio. 350 p. 15,5 × 24. Madrid 1983. Ediciones Cristiandad.

Gerstenblith, Patty, *The Levant at the Beginning of the Middle Bronze Age* (American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation Series 5). xvi-219 p. 28 × 21,7. Winona Lake, IN. 1983. Eisenbrauns. US \$15.00.

Horsley, G. H. R., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, 2. A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1977. iv-224 p. 24,3 × 18,2. North Ryde, New South Wales 1982. Macquarie University. US \$24.00.

Jaros, Karl, *Hundert Inschriften aus Kanaan und Israel*. Für den Hebräischunterricht bearbeitet. 120 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Fribourg/ Schweiz 1983. Schweizerisches Katholisches Bibelwerk. DM 19,80.

Kieffer, R. - Rydbeck, L., *Existence païenne au début du christianisme*. Présentation de textes grecs et romains. 176 p. 18,5 × 13,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 93.

Kugel, James L., *The Idea of Biblical Poetry*. Parallelism and its History. xi-339 15,5 × 23,4. New Haven - London 1983. Yale University Press.

Langevin, Gilles, *Les rapports du christianisme naissant avec le judaïsme* (Interviews révisées par les auteurs et présentées par Gilles Langevin 1). 160 p. 21,6 × 14. Montréal - Paris 1983. Éditions Bellarmin - Le Cerf. FF 40.

Langevin, Gilles, *La foi, le culte et la communauté* (Interviews révisées par les auteurs et présentées par Gilles Langevin 2). 150 p. 21,6 × 14. Montréal - Paris 1983. Éditions Bellarmin - Le Cerf. FF 40.

Langevin, Gilles, *La rencontre avec la civilisation gréco-romaine* (Interviews révisées par les auteurs et présentées par Gilles Langevin 3). 147 p. 21,6 × 14. Montréal - Paris 1983. Éditions Bellarmin - Le Cerf. FF 40.

Lohfink, Norbert, *Unsere großen Feste*. Meditationen. 100 p. 19,7 × 11,9. Freiburg - Basel - Wien 1983. Herder. DM-, 12,80.

Malherbe, Abraham J., *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. xi-144 p. 14 × 21,5. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press. \$6.95.

Morgan, Michael A., *Sepher Ha-Razim*. The Book of Mysteries (SBL Texts and Translations 25 Pseudepigrapha Series 11). 97 p. 22,5 × 15. Chico, CA 1983. Scholars Press. US \$8.95.

Sandalion, (Quaderni di Cultura Classica, Cristiana e Medievale 5). A cura di A. M. **Battegazzore** (et alii). 386 p. 21,4 × 14,9. Roma 1983. Herder Editrice.

Terrin, A. N. (et alii) *Le scienze della religione oggi*. Atti del convegno tenuto a Trento il 20-21 maggio 1981 a cura di Luigi Sartori (Scienze religiose 4). 273 p. 14 × 21,7. Bologna 1983. Centro Editoriale Dehoniano. Lit. 15.000.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

SCUOLA TIPOGRAFICA S. PIO X - VIA DEGLI ETRUSCHI, 7-9 ROMA - Aprile 1984